DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 577 HE 008 341

AUTHOR	Reck, W. Emerson
TITLE	The Changing World of College Relations. History and Philosophy 1917-1975.
INSTITUTION	Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[76]
NOTE	473p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($8.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Alumni; Development; Federal Government; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *History; *National Organizations; Organization; *Professional Associations; *Program Descriptions; *Public Relations
IDENTIFIERS	*Council for the Advancement and Support of educ

ABSTRACT

Discussed is the development, history, and organization of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The book draws heavily on records of CASE and its predecessor organizations as well as on the speeches and writings of college and university presidents, trustees, deans, and other leaders in higher education. CASE represents all the professional specializations in college and university advancement - alumni, administration, fund-raising, public relations, public information, publications, and periodicals. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

The Changing World of College Relations

History and Philosophy 1917-1975

by W. Emerson Reck

The Changing World Of College Relations

History and Philosophy 1917-1975

by W. Emerson Reck

Council for Advancement and Support of Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 1976

W. Emerson Reck, Vice President Emeritus of Wittenberg University, is the author of *Public Relations: A Program for Colleges and Universities*.

Copyright 1976 by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 76-22387

Printed in the United States of America

This Book is Dedicated
to those thousands of leaders
and volunteer workers who,
in the years since 1917,
have given generously
of their time, energy, and
talents to advance college
relations, thus making
contributions beyond measure
to millions of Americans
and their nation.

Contents

Foreword

1

The Early Years

Frankenberg's Dream, 1
Time Out for War, 5
Getting Back on the Road, 8
New Officers, New Ideas, 11

2

Growing Pains

Searching for the 'Big Idea', 14
Activities and Influence Grow, 18
Standards of Practice Adopted, 22
Search for a Better Name, 26
The Broader View Prevails, 30
Regional Structure Created, 35

3

New Challenges Emerge

ACPA Wars on Depression, 39
Members Reject Name Change, 43
Expanding the Membership, 48
Courting the Alumni Council, 52

4

Forward on All Fronts

ACPA Launches a Magazine, 58
Drive for a National Office Begins, 63
A Time of Goal Setting, 68
A Woman Takes Command, 75

5

War Clouds Over the Land

Girding for New Responsibilities, 83
Little Time to Celebrate, 93
Supporting the War Effort, 104
Public Relations Concept Grows, 113
The Association Changes Name, 123

6

Evolution of a National Office

A Modest First Step, 139
Year of the New Horizon, 148
Progress With a Light-Hearted Leader, 157
A Boost From the Presidents, 164
A Dream of Years Comes True, 174

7

ACPRA Faces New Problems

The University Under Fire, 184
Action in a Time of Hysteria, 194
Leaders Foresee Expanded Program, 201
'Counselor to Higher Education', 210
Warnings and Challenges, 218

8

Appraising the Association

Plans to Study 'Third Estate', 228
Search for Greater Effectiveness, 237
Challenges to Statesmanship, 247
A Year of Fulfillment, 259

9

Expansion in the Early Sixties

A New Year of Preparation, 270
'Year of Transition', 279
The 'Specialized Generalist' Appears, 288
Three-Year Plan Is Drawn, 299
Progress in Liaison With AAC, 308

10

Celebration—and Acceleration

Leadership From Texas, 322
Challenges to Run Faster, 333
Preparing for Broader Service, 345
A New Challenge: the Restless Campus, 355
Facing the Seventies: a Time to Lead, 367

11

On Course to a Greater Future

ACPRA and AAC Plan Joint Study, 377
Examination and Anticipation, 389
Progress Toward Unification, 402
The Decision Is Made, 414
New Name, New Promise, New Resolution, 426

Acknowledgments, 435

Sources of Information, 437

Reference Notes, 438

Index, 453

Foreword

The past fifty years have witnessed a revolution in the technology of communications as well as in our knowledge and understanding of group dynamics and interpersonal relationships.

Accompanying these changes, there has been an evolution in the relationships of educational institutions with such constituency groups as students, parents, faculty and staff members, trustees, alumni, community organizations, donors, government administrators, and legislators. A half-century ago, the starting point was a realization of the value to a college or university of an occasional newspaper item concerning educational programs. Today, virtually all colleges and universities have well-organized and effective programs of institutional advancement, making use of the techniques and technologies of communications and of the ever-growing body of knowledge provided by research in the social sciences.

In *The Changing World of College Relations*, Emerson Reck, himself a pioneer in educational public relations, traces both the development of the concept and philosophy of educational constituency relationships and the history of an organization composed of men and women working in this field.

Mr. Reck tells the story of the American Association of College News Bureaus, later called the American College Publicity Association, and still later named the American College Public Relations Association. When this organization was merged with the American Alumni Council in 1974 to form the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, all the professional specializations represented in college and university advancement—alumni administration, fund raising, public relations, government relations, public information, publications, and periodicals—came together in a single professional organization. Today, they constitute a powerful voice for higher education and its preeminent place in the American economy and society.

In this book, Mr. Reck draws heavily on the records of CASE and its predecessor organizations as well as on the speeches and writings of college and university presidents, trustees, deans, and other leaders in higher education who helped to develop the philosophy and practice of educational advancement.

To those who are concerned either with the historical development or with the future of college and university relationships with the groups they serve and to which they look for support, *The Changing World of College Relations* will be an invaluable resource.

Alice L. Beeman, President
Council for Advancement
and Support of Education

1

The Early Years

Frankenberg's Dream

A farmer's son who never went to college but gained distinction as a reporter and drama critic in Columbus, Ohio, fathered the movement from which modern-day college relations has evolved.

After two years of work on the project, Theodore Thomas Frankenberg founded the American Association of College News Bureaus (AACNB) on April 6, 1917. It was the first organization dedicated to publicizing American colleges.

"The father of AACNB" and its successor organizations came from a family distinguished in the educational field in its native town of Blankenburg, Germany, where Friedrich Froebel founded the kindergarten movement in 1837. When the movement was introduced in America nearly two decades later, Frankenberg's great-aunt, Caroline Frankenberg, founded a kindergarten for German-speaking children in Columbus, Ohio.[1]

Frankenberg himself had a colorful career, first in journalism, then in publicity and fund raising. In 1942, the American College Publicity Association—AACNB's name had been changed in 1930—observed its silver anniversary. On this occasion, Frankenberg could look back with pleasure on his publicity and fund-raising efforts. He had been instrumental in raising $100,000,000 for thirty-five colleges and universities in nineteen states.[2]

Two years after graduating from Central High School in Columbus, the twenty-year-old farm boy in 1897 began his newspaper career as a cub reporter with the Columbus *Dispatch*. Later he was assistant telegraph editor, but on March 1, 1899, he transferred to the Columbus *Citizen* as a member of its original staff.[3]

At the *Citizen* until 1903, and later at the *Ohio State Journal* for twelve years between 1903 and 1916, Frankenberg specialized in dramatic criticism. It was during those years that he became a legend among Columbus newspapermen for his dress, for his mode of transportation, and for carrying a black silver-headed cane he did not need. As a drama editor, Frankenberg was wont to appear at major theatrical and musical events wearing white tie, long tails, and silk hat in a day when only a handful of citizens other than the Governor of the State possessed such a wardrobe.[4]

For years drama critics on Columbus newspapers were regaled with accounts of how T.T.F. (the initials with which he always signed his pieces) used to cover his theater beat by bicycle, "his lanky physique being eminently adapted to that mode of locomotion."[5] For Frankenberg, riding a bicycle was both a means to good health and a method of economy. His home was two-and-a-half miles from downtown Columbus and the round trip each day helped to keep him trim.

Incidentally, Frankenberg's practice of signing his pieces T.T.F. made him the object of much kidding from local theater managers. The initials, they declared, stood for "theater tickets free."[6]

Frankenberg picked up the habit of carrying a cane at all times when he began working as a drama critic. He thought that, as theater editor, his position justified his ambition to carry a cane.[7] His habit became a hobby and at his death in 1958 he owned a score or more of "walking sticks." Most of them were gifts from admirers or individuals for whom he had done some thoughtful service or an unusually successful piece of work.

None of his canes was more prized than the silver-handled stick which the American College Publicity Association presented to him at its silver anniversary convention in 1942.

While employed by the *Ohio State Journal* as a general assignment reporter and feature writer in 1910, Frankenberg joined forces with Harry F. Harrington, a journalism teacher at Ohio State University. Together they wrote *Essentials in Journalism*, considered to be the first authoratative textbook in journalism.[8] To Harrington, later dean of the School of Journalism at Northwestern University, Frankenberg was a valued collaborator. Columbus newspapermen knew him as "the most descriptive writer in the city." As one colleague said later, "Every story Frankenberg wrote was consciously a literary effort."[9]

In 1914, somewhat by chance, Frankenberg got into college publicity work. W.W. Boyd, new president of Western College for Women at Oxford, Ohio, walked into the *State Journal's* editorial office and sought out Frankenberg. His objective, he said, was employment of a person capable of doing some publicity work for his institution. He had come to Frankenberg because he had seen and liked some work T.T.F. had done for the Ohio Sunday School Association and the Ohio YMCA.

"I have just been elected president of one of the finest little colleges in the country," Boyd told Frankenberg. "There is just one trouble. No one knows where it is, or anything about it. I thought you could do something about it."[10]

With no more formality than that, Frankenberg became part-time publicity officer for Western College with the title of counselor in publicity. The job opened interesting and challenging new fields for him. Shortly thereafter, he gave up his newpaper job to establish T. T. Frankenberg, Inc., "to serve worthy clients in publicity and advertising methods."[11]

When fund raiser George E. Lundy came to Ohio to raise $500,000 for the Friends Church, he called on Frankenberg. As a result of the "bang-up job" he did on publicity, Frankenberg became publicity director for Marts and Lundy when the pioneering fund-raising firm was organized in 1926. He remained with the firm for the rest of his active life. In 1952 he retired, after suffering a severe heart attack while overseeing a publicity campaign at Campbell College in Buies Creek, North Carolina.[12] He died July 26, 1958, at the age of eighty. To the day of his death he continued his interest in the organization he founded, his name appearing frequently among the contributors to its literature and the speakers at its conventions.

Possibly because of his background as a theater editor, Frankenberg always seemed to sense the dramatic or feature element in a story. His work helped to offset the play colleges were getting on sports and social life. Colleagues lauded him for his "fine artistic sense," declaring it was of great value in the fund-raising literature he produced.

"He was always on the lookout for some fine painting or statue he could put into a piece of publicity," a fellow worker with Marts and Lundy asserted. "In fact, he sometimes wished to put in some artistic piece which did not seem to have much to do with the campaign and I would argue with him about it."

"At one college, I remember, he produced a picture of a beautiful stairway. I told him it was beautiful—but what did it have to do with the campaign? He grinned and said, 'I don't think it has anything to do with the campaign, but it **is** a beautiful stairway'.

"We took our investigation a little further, however, and learned that the spiral stairway was a traditional meeting place for one of the oldest customs of the college. The picture, therefore, would naturally bring up feelings of nostalgia among the alumni and we put it in because it satisfied both Frankenberg's sense of the artistic and my sense of what would help produce the campaign funds."[13]

Soon after undertaking the publicity job for Western College, Frankenberg discovered that the publicity techniques being used by colleges were largely ineffective. He thought that there might be value in college representatives getting together and exchanging ideas.

"I began to ask around to find what, if any, other colleges were trying a similar experiment," he wrote later in one of the Association's publications. "Very few were. Correspondence developed the fact that some were interested."[14]

Frankenberg wrote letters to presidents of Ohio colleges, hoping to set up a meeting of publicity writers in May or June, 1915. Plans for this meeting were dropped, however, because the commencement season was approaching.

To those Ohioans who had shown interest in the spring, Frankenberg wrote again in early December asking if they "could and would come to a little conference" in Columbus on one of three dates: December 28, 29 or 30. After learning that a number were interested, he wrote to twelve out-of-state colleges. Three of them—Indiana University, DePauw University, and the University of Chicago—responded favorably.[15]

In preparation for the meeting, Frankenberg also wrote the editors of representative newspapers asking for their suggestions. From J. P. Gavit, managing editor of the New York *Evening Post*, he received a three-page reply. The letter fortified some of his own convictions and provided fuel for considerable discussion when his conference was held in a committee room at the Columbus Chamber of Commerce on December 29.

After decrying the fact that most colleges seemed to leave their publicity work in the hands of inexperienced people, such as students who concentrated on sports and extracurricular activities, Gavit wrote:

"The general effect of this is that the public hears of the college only when something outré happens which the college would be very glad to keep out of print, or that athletics is emphasized as if it were the principal business of the college. The really important events and developments relating to the real business of the college are entirely excluded.

"We [the *Post* maintained a college page] feel quite strongly that every college should make it the business of somebody to send to those newspapers that want it, regularly and intelligently, the news of the college as an institution. . . . Not all of them would use it, but the tendency would be to keep the college before the public as something other than a place where sophomores play tricks, or athletic achievements constitute the sum total of activity."[16]

Ten persons participated in the five-hour shoptalk meeting held on December 29. The discussions were devoted to publications, alumni cooperation, use of plate, news writing, and special problems and their remedies. No effort was made to form an organization, but Frankenberg was urged to arrange a similar meeting for the next year. Many or the men interested in improved college publicity were teachers of journalism. Therefore, Prof. Nathaniel W. Barnes of the University of Chicago suggested that the group endeavor to meet in conjunction with the American Association of Teachers of Journalism (AATJ), then only a little over three years old.[17]

Following Prof. Barnes' suggestion, Frankenberg explored the possibility of holding a meeting of college publicists in connection with the next conference of the AATJ. The meeting was first scheduled for March, 1917, and later set for April 5-7. Both James Melvin Lee of New York University, president of AATJ, and Harrington, who was in charge of the program for the conference, gave him a friendly reception. Frankenberg and his publicity associates would be welcome at the Chicago convention and Lee set aside a two-hour period on April 6 for the publicity group to have its own get-together. Prof. Harrington also scheduled Frankenberg to give a paper during AATJ's afternoon session that day.[18]

In an effort to get good attendance at the pioneering meeting in Chicago, Frankenberg during March wrote thirty-seven colleges and universities known to be interested in publicity work. He declared that the meeting would be the first of its character held anywhere in the country, and told each college that the practical problems of publicity would be considered.[19]

"Consider the Wastebasket" was the title of the paper Frankenberg gave during the AATJ convention. Many of those present were directly or indirectly interested in college publicity, and hopefully would attend the special meeting set for that evening. So Frankenberg devoted his paper largely to a study of the college contributions which he had dug out of the great wastebasket standing beside the desk of the state editor at the *Ohio State Journal*.

"The series of failures, or almost successes, put together in a dissertation, taken as a whole, covered the major sins of college publicity as it was too often practiced in that day," Frankenberg recalled later.[20] He also emphasized in his presentation his own convictions about the importance of the publicity man and college publicity.

"I feel that the importance of the publicity man to the college and university is growing daily," he asserted. "This is the inevitable result of the increasing complexity of the society of which we are a part. It is another outgrowth of the day of specialization which is upon us. It is further a fact that the possibilities for publicity are only just beginning to be realized.

"Publicity," he concluded, "will be important to American schools and colleges because this is a democracy, and publicity is the sure means of conserving the democracy of an institution. It will be increasingly important because, if these schools are to achieve their maximum possibilities, they must be kept close to the people. In order that this may be true, the people must know about them. This is the heritage of service to which you are called. Do not underestimate it."[21]

Following Frankenberg's address, twenty-four men and one woman met in a corner of the Hotel LaSalle's big conference hall for the history-making meeting of those interested in publicity. The group included Herbert Graham, University of Kentucky; John M. Cooney, University of Notre Dame; John R. Brumm, University of Michigan; M. L. Spencer, Lawrence College; Bernard Sobel, Purdue University; Clarence M. Baker, College of Agriculture, Ohio State University; Phil B. Bing, Madison, Wisconsin; William P. Kirkwood, University of Minnesota; Harry E. Martin, Mt. Union College; E. C. Hickman, Methodist Board of Education; H. W. Jordan, Educational Jubilee, Methodist Episcopal Church; Charles Arnold, University of Pittsburgh; Willard G. Bleyer and Grant M. Hyde, University of Wisconsin; J. W. Piercy, Indiana University; Ralph D. Casey, University of Montana; Kellogg D. McClelland, Knox College; Nelson Antrim Crawford, Kansas State Agricultural College; Charles F. Salt, Iowa State College; Melvin Ryder, formerly of Ohio State University; Conger Reynolds, University of Iowa; D. C. Matthews, Western Reserve University; M. Virginia Garner, Wesleyan College (Georgia); E. W. Smith, Leland Stanford Junior University, and Frankenberg.[22]

Frankenberg reported later that the group decided almost at once that an organization should be formed.

"The real argument," he said, "came on what the organization should be called. The more experienced practitioners were for calling themselves what they were, 'publicity directors'. But the very frankness of the term scared some of the more timid. In justification of their attitude it should not be forgotten that at that time the word 'publicity' was very largely associated with circuses and the less desirable forms of theatrical entertainment. Many of these were not in good repute on some campuses—even forbidden to students in some cases.So in the end the little group settled for the term American Association of College News Bureaus."[23]

In recognition of the efforts he had been making to pull together persons interested in college publicity, and probably because he was the only person present who could be described as a professional publicity man, Frankenberg was elected president of the new organization.

Frankenberg later advanced another reason for his election. He wrote: "That I became the first president was not due to any outstanding achievement on my part. Rather, I have aways thought it was because I had my own independent office and was free to use it as I pleased to promote the idea for which we stood."[24]

Other officers selected were E. W. Smith, vice president, and Bernard Sobel, secretary-treasurer.

Adoption of a brief constitution, which called for memberships to be held by institutions and dues to be $2 a year, concluded the business of the history-making session.[25]

Their meeting over, many of the founders of AACNB walked over to the old *Tribune* office to read the news bulletins on the day's important events.[26] The same day, Woodrow Wilson had signed the resolution which threw the United States into World War I at a cost which would total $32,080,268,968 and 119,437 American lives.

AACNB had come into existence as "America's first war baby."[27] A mere fledgling then, it was destined in the years ahead to help bring to higher education a greater measure of understanding, appreciation, and support than any one of its founders dared anticipate.

Time Out for War

President Frankenberg and Secretary Sobel lost no time in getting out news releases about the new organization. Inasmuch as no complete copy of the first constitution is known to have been published at this time, these releases are especially valuable because they reveal the organization's stated purposes in the words of the officers.

"Till now," said the release sent to trade journals, "the matter of college publicity has been slighted or ignored. Some colleges have disapproved of all publicity; others have considered it a necessary evil; while others have encouraged publicity of all sorts, with little regard for quality and method of distribution. As a result, the college publicity agent and his press bureau have been limited in their activities.

"The Association, as organized, hopes to change this condition by giving dignity, value, and system to college press bureaus; to establish order in the college world of publicity; and to give a definite place to the college publicity editor.

"It intends, furthermore, to establish a worthy and educational method by which the interests of the college may be furthered in a dignified way. It will strive, in particular, to make news matter largely educational in a broad sense. By systematizing college publicity methods, it purposes to distribute news in an efficient and economical manner. All these purposes are to be accomplished by means of intercollegiate correspondence, counseling, advisory meetings, and conventions."[28]

Hoping to enlarge the membership, Sobel also started a letter-writing campaign. He emphasized to college publicity workers and presidents the Association's potential "for bringing the colleges of the country closer together, for aiding them in their progress, and for enabling them to make public their activities and accomplishments." Referring to the $2 annual dues, Sobel said, "The amount is small, the value unlimited."[29]

Colleges and college people, however, were beginning to concentrate their energies on the war effort along with the rest of the nation. Soon a goodly number of those who had attended the founding meeting of AACNB were engaged in some form of war work. Vice President Smith, for instance, became publicity secretary for his Stanford classmate, Herbert Hoover, who had been chosen to head the U.S. Food Administration in Washington. Secretary Sobel was also in government service.

Frankenberg himself made arrangements to represent the National Association of Bakers in their relations with the public at a time when the conservation of wheat flour was a major problem.[30] Yet he still spent countless hours on AACNB correspondence and projects. In addition to routine correspondence, he carried on promotional work which led a number of larger institutions to join AACNB and found time to conduct a survey on the effect of the war on college news.

A summary of responses to the survey was published in January, 1918. It revealed that most colleges were continuing their publicity activities and getting approximately as much space in newspapers as before, especially if academic matters could in some way be associated with war interests. However, college publicists soon found their jobs becoming increasingly difficult. The newspapers, while facing the need to reduce size because of mounting costs, were giving much of their space to propaganda related to Liberty Loans, Thrift Stamps, food and fuel conservation, Red Cross work, and other interests looming large in the public mind.[31]

In his correspondence, Frankenberg nevertheless took every opportunity to emphasize his conviction that "we all have a common cause . . . that our work is so much a pioneering proposition that we can all benefit by an exchange of ideas and suggestions."[32]

Frankenberg also tried to plan a meeting for the AACNB membership, and his correspondence indicates that, as late as March 9, 1918, he was hoping it could be held in Cincinnati later that month. Following a mail vote, it was decided not to hold a convention in 1918.[33]

"All we could do was put the baby in an incubator and keep it alive by feeding it with a medicine dropper," Frankenberg reminisced in addressing delegates to the organization's silver anniversary convention in 1942.[34]

But Frankenberg did more than use a medicine dropper. He used the mails and personal contacts at every opportunity in an effort to induce those interested in college publicity to affiliate with AACNB. As a result, his first printed roster of members compiled at about this time included forty-seven names, among them twenty-three of the twenty-five who attended the founding session.

"These [forty-seven] names," he explained, "do not mean necessarily that their owners were in attendance in 1917 but that by correspondence they had shown interest in the object for which the Association of College News Bureaus was organized."[35]

That first roster also included names of men doing publicity for organizations other than colleges. Listed, for instance, were three newspaper editors and representatives of the Institute of Meat Packers, the Methodist Church and its Board of Education, a bank, and two feature syndicates. No official connection was shown for four of the men listed.[36]

Explaining why at least eight of the persons on the roster were not associated with colleges, Frankenberg commented: "At the outset the American Association of College News Bureaus was the only organization of publicity workers anywhere in America. As a result, it carried on its membership list for a considerable period of time men associated with church educational work, industrial educational work, and financial promotional work."[37]

Although Frankenberg gave forty-seven persons the courtesy of listing on the AACNB roster, only fourteen paid the $2 dues. The treasury nevertheless showed a balance of $15.45 because expenditures had been only $12.55. At the time, two-cent postage made it possible to write hundreds of letters for so small an outlay.[38]

Frankenberg's efforts during the war months were by no means limited to letter writing and personal contacts. Pending the end of the war and the country's return to normalcy, he sought to keep alive the interest of present and prospective members with periodic newsletters. The articles covered publicity techniques, the shortage of newsprint, the turnover of newspaper staff, and personality sketches as well as appeals for cooperation of members in promoting AACNB.

At the close of the school year in June,1918, Frankenberg sent out a three-page newsletter in which he briefly reviewed AACNB activities. He sketched the activities of several college publicity men who were in government service, and summarized unusual conditions posed by both newspaper editors and publicity officers as a result of the war. Writing about AACNB activities, he said:

"Nothing that the AACNB has achieved in the past nine months can, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered as epoch making. . . . From time to time, however, the activity of the members has come to public attention and it is doubtful whether any organization of such limited numbers has a higher proportion of men who are in one form or another of national service by reason of the war."[39]

Although the armistice of November, 1918, saw an end to many of the problems that had restricted AACNB's activities and growth potential since the day of its founding, colleges faced onerous problems in readjusting to peacetime. Not the least of these, so far as AACNB was concerned, was the shortage of manpower for publicity work in journalism faculties at many institutions.

Celebration of the Armistice had scarcely ended when, on November 14, Frankenberg mailed a newsletter in which he emphasized the problems and opportunities now facing college publicity men and discussed the need for renewing and expanding AACNB activities.[40]

More than a year passed, however, before AACNB was able to hold a reorganization meeting. Meanwhile, there was talk of holding a joint meeting in March, 1919, with the American Association of Agricultural College Editors as well as AATJ. This proposal was finally abandoned because many journalism teachers and news bureau men were still in some branch of government service or had so lately resumed their campus work that they could ill afford a trip to a conference.[41]

A letter Frankenberg wrote to President Edward H. Todd of the College of Puget Sound on November 12, 1919, reveals that the time and place for AACNB's first postwar convention had still not been selected. It was not until shortly before Christmas that the dates of January 2-3, 1920, were set. The program was yet to be drawn, but again it would be held in conjunction with AATJ, this time at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago.

Except for a "social conference" and the inspection of exhibits on Friday night, the program was confined to five talks in the morning and an open forum in the afternoon on Saturday, January 3. In addition to the president's address, the morning program included "What Do Colleges Expect of Publicity," by Ralph W. Bell, Western Reserve University; "Press Bulletins—Do They Pay?" by Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois; "What Publicity Costs," by W. W. Woods, Institute of American Meat Packers, and "Is Cooperative Use of Plate Possible?" by W. A. Patterson, Western Newspaper Union.

Bell, who defined publicity as "that which places the names and activities of the institution, and of all persons connected with it, favorably before the public," declared that "it seems to me that it is even criminal not to spread as broadcast as possible the services and opportunities which the university offers."

Emphasizing the values publicity had in attracting good students and faculty members as well as generating gifts and general good will, Bell was the first person to suggest to AACNB members that publicity was more than news stories. Indeed, he pointed out it should include such means of getting attention and conveying information as magazine articles, special pamphlets, pictorial booklets, catalogs, slides, moving pictures, calendars, and sepia postcards.[42]

The war, Frankenberg said in his address, had made colleges fully aware of the value of publicity. Members of AACNB now faced the challenge of meeting fully the opportunities for individual and concerted effort.

"Whether or not the colleges of America were alive to the possibilities of well-directed publicity before the war, there can be no doubt now that at least the leaders in education are convinced that it is one of the necessary factors of a well-organized institution," he declared.

". . . No single force was of greater value in the prosecution of the war than that of well-directed publicity. Publicity raised the army. Publicity sold the bonds. Publicity put over war savings stamps and all the wartime benevolences. Publicity kept a nervous public, if not satisfied, at least quiescent in the face of a variety of restrictions (on flour, sugar, light, etc.) which few

Americans would have deemed possible even five years ago . . . and the acquiescence of the American public in these so stringent reforms would not have been possible without the unstinted outpouring of printer's ink, guided and directed by the keen intelligence of the publicity director."

Frankenberg concluded his address with a challenge to his colleagues.

"To the degree that we are pioneers," he said, "we must recognize our responsibility of bringing to others the vision that has been given to us. . . .

"The opportunities are before us. The need for service is plain, and I am convinced will become clearer as we extend our numbers and our field of operations. The opportunities of cooperation are growing every day and the advantages of such cooperation, I am convinced, will be clearer to all of us as we proceed along this line."[43]

At their business meeting the delegates honored Frankenberg for his twenty-one months of ceaseless effort by reelecting him president. Grant M. Hyde, a University of Wisconsin professor, better known as the author of authoritative texts on journalism, was named vice president, and Josef F. Wright, director of the news bureau at the University of Illinois, was elected secretary-treasurer.

AACNB, despite the loss of half its founding members to one area of wartime activity or another, had survived, its health somewhat impaired, but its vision of future opportunities and challenges clearer than ever.

"That the AACNB survived the many adverse circumstances of the war is a high tribute to the man who founded the Association," one of the organization's early historians wrote. "Mr. Frankenberg was in every sense a pioneer and an executive. He saw in the AACNB a great force for education, saw it, moreover, as it utilized the various media of communication. Without his practical idealism the successful beginnings of educational publicity in America could never have been written."[44]

Getting Back On the Road

AACNB's first postwar convention brought to the front of the ranks a man destined to play a leadership role in the Association and its successor organizations for more than three decades. He was Josef F. Wright, twenty-seven-year-old director of the news bureau at the University of Illinois, to whom the duties of secretary-treasurer were entrusted.

"To him, more than any other one person, is due the credit for getting the struggling infant out in front so that people could see it," Frankenberg wrote twenty-two years later.[45]

Wright, after four months of prodding the speakers, collected all but one of the convention addresses, mimeographed them in eighteen pages and distributed them to the membership. He also took over publication of a newsletter, *Occasional Bulletin*, wrote individual letters to college and university personnel around the country, and handled what little money came into the treasury through the annual dues of $2.

Grant Hyde, who had headed the University of Wisconsin press bureau since 1915, also had a heavy correspondence. Since he was recognized as a pioneer in the field, many faculty members or faculty-members-to-be who had been assigned the publicity work for their institutions wanted his advice. At first he used two types of letters—a two-page one for those who had had some newspaper experience, and a four-page one for teachers of English and others who obviously had had no such experience.

Finally, tiring of it all, he developed a letter which said in essence: "If you have had no newspaper experience, you shouldn't have accepted the assignment."[46]

Although he left the membership drive largely up to Wright, Frankenberg continued to promote the interests of AACNB and was especially alert to articles which would show the values of its work and encourage greater dedication on the part of members.

One of the pieces which he circulated was excerpted from an address delivered before the American Association of Registrars by J.W. Cravens, registrar at Indiana University.

Based on a survey made among 300 institutions, Cravens' address revealed that only eighty-one of the schools had publicity men and of these fifty-nine persons were devoting only part-time to publicity. Their remaining time, in most cases, went to teaching. Of the 300 institutions, however, 160 were regularly supplying newspapers with releases, in most cases through student reporters.

Cravens' address also sketched various ways in which a college and those associated with it benefit from publicity. He used some telling sentences to emphasize his belief that "every educational institution should have its publicity man."

"No business organization or interest in the country is so poorly and unsystematically advertised as the educational institutions," he asserted.

". . . An educational institution's mission is two-fold—to have something worthwhile and to let the people know about it. . . . there is a work for the publicity agent which is of priceless advantage not only to the educational institutions, but to the public as well."[47]

An address on "The Ethics of Publicity," given by Bristow Adams of Cornell University before the American Association of Agricultural College Editors at its convention in July, 1920, came to Frankenberg's attention in October. He quickly issued an invitation for the New Yorker to speak before the AACNB convention being planned for St. Louis in late December.

Adams noted that 6,732 persons had given "publicity" as their occupation in a recent New York City survey. He stepped down hard on publicity and publicity men when he said, "Among many of those who profess to be publicity agents, ethical standards are woefully low, or are lacking altogether."[48]

In a letter inviting Adams to speak at the upcoming convention, Frankenberg remarked that the Cornell editor had made several good points in his address. But he let it be known that he disagreed strongly with some of the content of the speech.

"I know the type of publicity man against whom you lodge your charges," he said. "I think, however, that you are making an unwarranted assumption when you assume all intelligence and virtue on the part of the editors."[49]

And so it came about that Adams was a featured speaker when members of AACNB assembled in St. Louis December 29-30 to hold their convention in conjunction with that of AATJ. Although its tone had been softened considerably, Adams' paper still challenged the college newsmen to examine their procedures closely lest they bring harm to their colleges and to their profession.

"Ordinarily I have little use for the one who seems to oppose or criticize a new and growing movement," he declared, "But at this time, when the profession of publicity is growing, and growing largely without standards, and especially without ethical ideals, it seems a duty on the part of us who are in the game to try to keep it clean lest those on the outside shall condemn it wholly."

Drawing his illustrations entirely from outside the college field, Adams bitterly criticized the attitude of some publicists that "publicity is news with a purpose."

"The three main drawbacks to publicity as it is usually carried on," he said, "are these: first, that it is overdone; second, that it is crudely done; and third, that not infrequently the idea of publicity itself fixes the program or character of the event or institution seeking publicity."

Often, Adams contended, the event publicized was being engineered to suit the publicity purpose. "Most publicity," he said, "and especially a large part of both the professional and amateur publicity, even for educational institutions, is blatant self-advertising, and by means that have nothing to do with the purposes and principles of the institution.

"There is only one criterion for judging copy—call it information, or publicity, or what you will—and that is whether it is news. Just stop there, and forget whether it has a purpose. News with a purpose is news with a bias . . . the policy that wins in the long run is based on honest news. Here again honesty is the best policy."[50]

The delegates were impressed by the forthright talk of the impressive-looking editor from Cornell. When it came time to elect new officers Adams got the nod for the AACNB presidency. He replaced Frankenberg, who had expressed belief that the reins of leadership should be passed along to someone more closely identified with the college field.

Women played a leading role in AACNB affairs starting with the St. Louis convention. Two of the eight papers given at the convention were presented by women. M. Virginia Garner of Wesleyan College and Mercer University in Macon, Georgia, was appropriately the first female speaker, delivering the address "Where Publicity Is Appreciated."

Nearly four years earlier, Miss Garner had been the lone woman among the twenty-five persons who had signed their names to the roster of AACNB founders. The founder of journalism departments at five colleges, Miss Garner was interested in AACNB primarily because of its association with AATJ, in which she was one of the first women to hold office.

The other female speaker at the convention was Alice M. Hunter of Nebraska Wesleyan, whose subject was "Educating the Professor to a News Sense." Later in the meeting she was elected vice president and thus became AACNB's first woman officer. Josef F. Wright was reelected secretary-treasurer.

The power of publicity in fund raising was also touched upon for the first time in an AACNB convention when R. Arthur Basham of Indianapolis, field secretary for the Presbyterian Board of Education, spoke on "The Relation of Publicity to Financial Campaigns." Pointing out that half of the financial campaigns recently held by colleges had fallen short of their goals, Basham urged thorough preparation, including careful surveying and detailed planning, before launching a publicity effort in behalf of a fund campaign.

"It is," he said, "as absurd to plan a campaign under what might easily be shown to be adverse conditions as it is to plant peonies in a garden with the temperature below zero in midwinter and expect them to bloom. . . . Under a well-timed barrage of information, not too extensive but well-placed and directed, the infantry (solicitors) can then go out and attain the objective."[51]

A second address tying publicity with fund raising was given at the convention. D. G. Auger of Association Endowments of New York City spoke on "Raising College Endowment Funds." Two St. Louis newspapermen gave tips on seeking out newsworthy material and how to prepare acceptable copy. Also on the program were an address on "Agricultural and Industrial Publicity" by Nelson Antrim Crawford of Kansas State Agricultural College, and Frankenberg's presidential address.

Because of Frankenberg's fondness for canes and the high regard in which he was held by AACNB members, Wright had suggested in a letter that a cane of special design might be adopted as a symbol of Association membership.

"I would no more think of going to St. Louis [for the up-coming convention] without my stick than I would without the rest of my baggage," Frankenberg wrote in his reply. "If you can sell the idea to our membership you have my unqualified endorsement and you can count on me for a new stick of any type, from the impossible cross-grained mahogany sticks which the London chappie carries, to the true black thorn which can only be bought in Ireland. Then there are bamboos, malaccas, birch, hickories, and many other types of cane, each of which has its advantage and attraction."

Since no record was kept of business transacted at the convention, except for the election of officers, it must be presumed that members did not greet Wright's idea with enthusiasm.[52]

In his valedictory, Frankenberg told his colleagues that AACNB needed not only more members and more funds, but a much broader program including several standing committees. One of these, he said, should seek to establish definite goals for the organization, and another should draw a code of ethics.

"To bring home to the publicity man of schools and colleges his increasing responsibility and his need to know the newer developments and greater possibilities of his calling, as his work grows and expands in response to public demands, is an obvious avenue of service for this Association," he declared.

"Since his immediate field of contact, the college, and his field of direct activities, the press, have shown a new appreciation of the publicity man and his mission during the past year, he would be wanting utterly in professional zeal or even in personal character if he did not feel the urge to higher standards, greater energy, and a finer technique. . . .

"Publicity is essentially an attribute of democracy," Frankenberg concluded, "and it must follow that the ideal flourishes much more successfully in America than elsewhere in the world, and by that very token we know ourselves to be observed both at home and abroad. Publicity is a socializing influence. Where employed for a school or any other purpose, its aim is to take an idea or a standard, an ideal or a fact, and popularize it, to sow it broadcast, to make two or three adherents grow where but one grew before.

". . . . the publicity worker of the future and preeminantly the college publicity worker, will strive with the elect of the world for the uplift and betterment of mankind."[53]

New Officers, New Ideas

Unfortunately, AACNB records for the years 1920-21 and 1921-22 are all but nonexistent. Two single sheet copies of the *Occasional Bulletin* are said to have been issued in 1920-21 but no copies are known to be extant.

From an exchange of letters between Vice President Hunter and Secretary Wright it appears that some uneasiness arose concerning President Adams' actual interest in the news bureau group. If Adams had relegated AACNB to a secondary place among his many interests, the fact would not have been hard to understand. One of the most versatile men ever to head the organization, he was an artist of national reputation before turning twenty-one, co-founder of two national publications and editor of another before he was thirty, an eight-year veteran of public relations with the U.S. Forestry Service before he was forty and shortly thereafter named professor, editor and chief of publications for the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell.

A past national president of the American Association of Agricultural Editors, Adams was more closely tied with that organization and with AATJ than with college publicity people. To him and to some of the teacher members of the publicity organization, AACNB was in fact something of a division of AATJ.

Miss Hunter revealed her feelings in a letter written to Secretary Wright on December 19, 1921, little more than a week before the publicists were to gather at the University of Wisconsin for their first meeting on a college campus.

"I cannot understand his [Prof. Adams'] attitude at all," she wrote. "Mr. Crawford [of Kansas State Agricultural College] sends me the monthly bulletin with the proposed program of the Association of College News Bureaus, Teachers of Journalism, and Teachers of Advertising. The last is new, is it not? Can it be that Mr. Adams is working the first named institution into the third?

". . . I note also that the 'News Bureau' part is relegated to third place every time. If one may judge from this and Mr. Adams' speeches last winter, he is preparing for some historic movement which will place the News Bureau upon the shelf. Are you game for a last-minute rescue?"[54]

Replying two days later, Wright declared that he, too, was "not at all satisfied with the order of things at Wisconsin [scene of next meeting]."

"When I agreed that the AACNB should meet in conjunction with the Teachers of Journalism," the secretary wrote, "I was of the opinion that the meeting this year would be similar to that at St. Louis last December when the two organizations did not conflict to any great extent. But here now we have four [sic] organizations, and ours seems to be relegated to the rear as the most unimportant. . . . I am exceedingly sorry that we did not meet in Chicago or elsewhere all by ourselves and let those who were really enough interested in publicity to come, do so, and those who were not, stay away.

"Personally, I would rather be at a meeting of only a half dozen dyed-in-the-wool publicity people than be where there were forty who were interested in publicity only as a side line. Observation has convinced me anyway that a 'prof' or a purely academic mind is a pretty poor publicity person when we take into consideration honest-to-goodness results. . . . I shall do what I can to see that we meet alone next year."

Wright also wrote Frankenberg about the matter, but the ex-president carefully avoided saying anything which might encourage a split in the organization.

"I think you will appreciate that a sense of delicacy has kept me from taking an active part in the past year's work of the society," he wrote Miss Hunter on December 23. "I may say to you personally, however, that I feel that Mr. Wright has not had the support to which the secretary is entitled, and in a society such as AACNB its growth and development depends almost entirely on the activity of the president and secretary.

"I helped keep this society alive during the troublesome days of the war," he added, "and I should greatly regret seeing it injured in any way at the present time."[55]

Although Adams made "a rather gloomy report on the amount of cooperation he had received during his term," the effort to shelve publicity interests feared by Miss Hunter and Wright did not materialize. Adams' presidential address was entitled "A Constructive Program for the Association of College News Bureaus." Unfortunately, no copy of it or of any of the other convention addresses has been preserved. The program was notable for three reasons. Speaking on "Publicity for Educational Institutions," E. A. Birge of the University of Wisconsin became the first college president to address the Association. Secondly, a term destined to become the focus of the Association's attention two decades later first appeared on the program when Paul I. Aldrich discussed "Public Relationships." Thirdly, formal addresses were kept to a minimum [three] and round-table discussions were featured. Subjects covered in the latter were "Methods of Finding College News for Presentation," "Methods of Avoiding Unfavorable Publicity," "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Publicity Agent," "The Greatest Needs in College Publicity," and "Placement Bureaus for News Workers."[56]

After hearing the last-named discussion, the Association took the first step toward providing what came to be one of its major services some thirty years later. This was the appointment of a committee "to investigate the possibility of forming a placement bureau for publicity workers." Miss Hunter was named chairman of the committe, and Ruby A. Black of the University of Wisconsin and Crawford were the other members.

A completely new slate of officers was elected with Nelson Antrim Crawford of Kansas State Agricultural College as president; E. W. Smith of Leland Stanford University, vice president of the founding group, again holding that post; and Miss Black, secretary-treasurer.[57]

Records for Crawford's administration are meager, but it can be surmised that the new president had difficulty finding time for AACNB affairs. That year, he was not only head of the Department of Industrial Journalism, superintendent of the Printing Department and director of the press service at Kansas State, but also managing editor of the *Kansas Industrialist*, associate editor of *The Midland*, starting work on his text, *The Ethics of Journalism*, and maintaining his reputation as a prize-winning poet by, among other things, working on an anthology of poetry.[58]

The records extant for 1921-22 do indicate that membership continued under forty, that Edward L. Bernays, later to become famous for his work in public relations, gave an address at the convention held on the Northwestern University campus December 29-31, and that the convention program otherwise was devoted to the presidential address and eight round-table discussions, most of them on "how to" subjects.[59]

In his presidential address, Crawford introduced a new concept of the news bureau man's work: that he must interpret the public to his institution as well as interpret his institution to the public. Describing Crawford's idea as "a somewhat novel view," the *Occational New Letter* for January, 1923, quoted from his address as follows:

"College people are proverbially prone to get out of touch with the people. . . . That large sections of the public have lost confidence in educational institutions is evident from the bitter attacks upon college education in newspapers and magazines. Undoubtedly, part of the complaint against American education is unjustified, but part of it is justified. . . . In any event, whether the complaints are justified at all or not, it is of the utmost importance to educational institutions to know what these complaints are and if necessary to remold the educational structure to meet present-day needs.

"Every college needs some one who will bring to it unbiased tidings of the world outside. This work of interpreting the public to the college is one of the principal functions and just now, in my estimation, the most important function of the college news bureau or information service."

Crawford's statement, according to the *Occasional News Letter,* did not result in a general discussion from the floor, but after adjournment there was "a great deal of conversation as to the diplomacy which would be required on the part of the news bureau head in performing such a function as that suggested."[60]

Notable, too, is the fact that women led the discussion for three of the eight round tables: Miss Garner on "The College President and the Press Service," Miss Hunter on "The Present Status of Press Service in Colleges and Universities," and Miss Black on "Copy for Special Journals."[61]

By accident, he declared later, William Paul Kirkwood, editor for the Division of Publications at the College of Agriculture of the University of Minnesota, became the new president of AACNB in the election at Northwestern. Kirkwood, who had earned his first money as a shoeshine boy and later worked on the Minneapolis *Journal* without pay for six months to learn the rudiments of news reporting,[62] was at Northwestern chiefly to attend sessions of the Association of Teachers of Journalism. He had been one of the twenty-five original members of AACNB in 1917, but even then his presence was due largely to his interest in the activities of AATJ. He had been responsible for establishing courses in news writing and editing at the University of Minnesota but had never taken such courses himself. To quote his own words, he "was at Northwestern at the time to try to make up for my formal educational deficiencies."

"With other 'teachers' I dropped in on a morning session devoted to news bureau problems," he recalled in 1951 in a sketch of his AACNB administration. "Some matter was up about which (having taken a master's degree for a thesis on publicity methods at the University of Missouri that spring) I felt I knew something.

"Quite naturally this offered me an opportunity to unload some of my recently acquired 'higher learning', and I could not resist. Whatever it was I said, it seemed to please, and I left to turn my attention to other matters.

"That afternoon I was informed that I had been elected president of the News Bureau Association. I have ever since felt that if I had not voiced my opinions that morning, I would never have been thought of for the office."[63]

Elected to serve with Kirkwood were Marvin G. Osborn, Sr., of the University of Louisiana as vice president, and Alice Hunter as secretary-treasurer. Osborn's son was destined to become the Association's president thirty-seven years later.[64]

2

Growing Pains

Searching For the 'Big Idea'

Accident or not, the election of Bill Kirkwood to the presidency marked the beginning of new life for AACNB. Imaginative and aggressive, he had dreams of broader work for publicity and of greater stature for the publicity man. It was during his administration that the public relations concept began to take shape, although nearly two decades would pass before it would come into clear focus.

"The then current style of publicity," Kirkwood wrote later, "was aimed too exclusively at advertising that would get students and, possibly, contributions to endowment.

"With the passing of time I had come to feel that I could do a great deal for my institution by creating an interest in and support for it among people . . . in every walk of life. Now, with my election to this new office, I began to play with the reverse idea of a kind of arts college publicity that would contribute to the better living and welfare of doctor, lawyer, merchant, or chief, butcher, baker, or candlestick maker. In other words, why should not an arts college be organized to direct its educational forces at its outside public as well as at its student population—and through its news bureau, in great part?"[1]

Although more immediate problems forced Kirkwood to put most of his ideas on a back burner for the time being, he did not abandon them. Records would show that many of these ideas provided new horizons for AACNB before he turned the presidency over to a successor at the end of a thirty-month tenure, longest in Association history, that of Frankenberg excepted.

Before leaving Evanston, Kirkwood called together his officers to map activities for the year. Kirkwood himself would revive the *Occasional Bulletin*, dormant since Wright's term as secretary-treasurer in 1920-21. The membership drive would be left largely to Miss Hunter, who found the current roster clogged with deadheads. All three officers would serve as a placement bureau to assist men and women seeking positions in the college publicity field. A program broader in scope would be an objective for the next convention, set for the following December.[2]

The work schedule for the officers was followed according to plan and the membership had more than doubled from forty to just under 100 by the time the 1923 convention was held at the LaSalle Hotel in Chicago on December 27-29. "Variety and diversity in publicity work" could have been the theme for the convention program. The delegates heard not only about proven methods in the college field in this country but also about those used in Scotland, England, the dairy industry, meat packing, railroading, and fund raising.[3]

The program was received with enthusiasm. The delegates authorized their officers to print resumes in a bulletin to be distributed free to all members and sold to others at fifty cents a copy. Nevertheless, Kirkwood felt that the program was overloaded with techniques and methods and did not give enough attention to plan and organization, either for the individual news bureau or the Association.

Because it appeared to him that "we were trying to make a study of how to do some-

22

thing before we had decided just what it was we wished to do," he requested Frankenberg to draw a statement of purpose to be presented to the convention. It read:

"The purpose of this organization is to bring together college news editors and other representatives interested in the news services of American colleges and universities.

"The members of the Association understand this to mean: By the exchange of ideas and experiences at meetings and otherwise on the part of members, to study, systematize, and develop the technique and practice of mediating between the schools represented and the public, with particular reference to the use of all forms of periodicals and publications; to create, by whatever legitimate means may be available, a favorable public opinion for the schools represented in that portion of the general public of most importance to the school."[4]

"Mr. Frankenberg's statement . . . hit the mark as we saw it in those days . . . but was too limited to suit me," Kirkwood asserted. "What I really wanted was not a statement of policy but rather a detailed plan of organization for the achievement of certain specified results. I was anxious to see the Association become something more and better than an agency to help college news bureaus get the names of their colleges in the papers with considerable frequency. . . . The trouble was that I did not know just what I did want. I was groping."[5]

In his remarks to the convention—Kirkwood did not give a presidential address as earlier presidents had done—he emphasized that AACNB must be a *working* organization. He also declared: (1) that to make the work of the Association of greater value there would have to be united work by the entire membership, every member doing something to promote thought and action; (2) that there should be a larger membership fee in order to provide for an adequate newsletter at regular intervals; and (3) that the Association should take up for careful consideration the possibility of using other media of publicity than the printed word.[6]

Registering large satisfaction with the advances made by their Association during the preceding year, the delegates reelected all three officers—President Kirkwood, Vice President Osborn, and Secretary Alice Hunter who had recently gone to Ward-Belmont College from Nebraska Wesleyan.

As an indication that he was still not satisfied with AACNB's direction, and was still groping, Kirkwood appointed a Committee on the Future of the Association before the convention adjourned. Douglass W. Miller of Ohio Wesleyan was appointed chairman and Frankenberg and Wright additional members.[7]

Later Kirkwood wrote Miller that his object in creating the committee was two-fold: "To get before the members . . . a definite idea of what the Association can, and will try to do, and to commit the members of the Association to a program of real work." Kirkwood also suggested that systematic research might be a logical part of the Association's program.[8]

When AACNB held its next convention on December 29-31, 1924, again at Chicago's LaSalle Hotel and again in conjunction with AATJ, the first important item on the program was the report of the Committee on the Future of the Association.

After hearing this report the Association took four important steps: (1) to hold future meetings independently of other organizations; (2) to change the time of its annual meetings to the latter part of June; (3) to name a Research Committee charged with collecting and making available to members data pertaining to college and university publicity; and (4) to give further study to the desirability of framing a set of principles for the guidance of members as well as for the information of college and university executives and interested newspapermen.[9]

The decision to hold future meetings independently grew out of the conflict of interests caused by holding sessions concurrently with the American Association of Teachers of Journalism, to which many AACNB members also belonged. The decision to change the time of meetings resulted from difficulty in securing good attendance during the Christmas holidays when other organizations and duties were demanding the attention of members.

Action on three other recommendations of Miller's committee were delayed until the next convention. These recommendations were: (1) that the Association be better financed through the establishment of institutional memberships and a possible increase in annual dues; (2) that a committee be appointed to develop means of impressing the importance of proper publicity upon executives of colleges, educational associations, and foundations; and (3) that a committee be appointed to promote the interests of college and university publicity among newspapermen and to further recognition of the Association as a responsible professional organization. Although the Association seems to have meant from its beginning for membership to be held by institutions, this plan had not been strictly followed.

Kirkwood named John E. Stempel of Lafayette College chairman of the Research Committee. The other members were two men destined to become presidents of AACNB within five years—Frank R. Elliott of Indiana University and Ralph S. Clark of Carnegie Institute of Technology. The job of further developing a statement of aims and principles for the Association was left to Miller with the understanding that he would report at the next convention.[10]

Although delegates felt that members could derive the most profit from attendance at the annual meeting, they believed committees, such as that charged with research, could provide additional benefits. It was suggested that this committee could, for example, assemble material relative to fund-raising campaigns carried on by various institutions, analyze such material, and formulate a practical plan for use by any member whose institution was contemplating a campaign. The committee might also analyze the different methods of news distribution and give members the results for guidance in their work.

Kirkwood, with some sense of satisfaction, expressed the feeling that AACNB was beginning to find itself as a working organization. The convention program, however, was again devoted largely to papers on the "how to" aspects of publicity work.

As the convention closed, Secretary Hunter reported that the treasury was in its best shape ever, with cash in hand totaling $135.95 plus ninety-two cents in postage stamps.[11] The membership stood at 113. No action to increase dues was taken. The current officers—Kirkwood, Osborn, and Miss Hunter—were asked to remain at the helm until the next convention.

Kirkwood went to Madison, Wisconsin, the site selected for the AACNB convention of June 25-27, 1925, "hoping for some quickening as to the 'big idea' for which he had been groping for two years."

"Had the time come for what I had been trying to catch and nail down?" he wrote in his unpublished manuscript. "It was soon apparent that it had not come, but we were 'getting warm'. My own thinking was becoming clearer, and our Research Committee was drawing nearer to what I was after.

"The problem I was working at was 'the possibilities' of the college news bureau. Could not an arts college news bureau be so organized, and given such authority to draw on all resources of the college, as to enable it to dip into the life of the [college's] people almost at will, educating the youth within its walls and the public outside? In short, why should not a news bureau become a public relations department or, better still, a 'university relations' department or a 'college relations' department, ever creating new extramural contacts?"[12]

The Research Committee recommended that the membership as a whole consider five problems during 1925-26: (1) publicity practices among members; (2) different types of college publicity "with particular reference to quality rather than quantity, in an endeavor to set some standard definition for 'favorable publicity' "; (3) the best techniques to follow in obtaining pictorial publicity; (4) radio broadcasting as a means of obtaining publicity; and (5) direct-by-mail advertising with reference to its application to college publicity.[13]

The Research Committee itself was expected to address the first problem and provide an annual survey, for the Association files, covering the college publicity field.

Information sought, the committee said, would cover items such as budgets, expenditures, personnel, forms of publicity, and possibly special campaigns.

During an earlier discussion, Grant M. Hyde, University of Wisconsin news director, had maintained that "the great problem before the college or university publicity director is not that of writing and distributing news but that of being a real public relations adviser of his executives."[14] The delegates voted him the job of conducting the study related to problem two. The surveys related to pictorial publicity, radio broadcasting, and direct-mail advertising were assigned to Edwin H. Rohrbeck of Pennsylvania State College, Douglass W. Miller of Ohio Wesleyan, and Josef F. Wright of the University of Illinois, respectively. The report on standards of practice was heard, continued work was requested, and a follow-up was scheduled as a subject of special business for the 1926 meeting.

At the 1925 meeting Wright suggested that the Association sponsor preparation of a textbook or manual on publicity for use by publicity directors and in courses on publications. Twenty-three years passed and the Association changed its name twice before this idea was implemented in 1948.[15]

The publicity clinic, a popular feature of conventions during the remaining years of the 1920s, was introduced by Kirkwood at the 1925 convention. As director of the clinic, John G. Baker, state editor of the Milwaukee *Journal*, said he had received 1,100 stories in response to a call for specimens of college news copy. Realizing the hopelessness of trying to criticize all of these, he selected a few typical releases, then made "pointed and effective comments."

The first thing a college publicity director should do, he said, was make a study of the papers in his territory, for submitted material should be geared to the quality and breadth of a paper's circulation. Directors should also study the style favored by newspapers in preparing copy in order to make it "easy to take." Tying college stories in with general news of the day was also recommended, along with greater emphasis on service stories, features, and personality sketches.

"Your duty," Baker told the news bureau directors, "is not to get your stuff printed but to get it read. Compare your stuff to a speech you might make to a miscellaneous audience of average intelligence. If you make such a comparison you ought to be able to tell whether your stuff will get the newspaper editor's interest."[16]

Frank R. Elliott, director of the publicity service at Indiana University and a diligent worker for AACNB since 1921, was elected president of the Association succeeding Kirkwood. John E. Stempel of Lafayette College became the vice president, and Thomas R. Johnston of Purdue was elected secretary-treasurer. The Association now recorded 125 individual and institutional members.[17]

AACNB was moving toward broader acceptance and service. Six institutions representing the Far West, South, Middle West, and East issued invitations for the Association to hold its 1926 convention on their campuses. Only six months earlier, the organization had decided to hold future meetings independently of other groups. However, the delegates now voted to leave selection of the 1926 meeting site in the hands of the officers with the hope that the next convention could be held jointly with the American Association of Agricultural College Editors.[18]

In his valedictory, Kirkwood again emphasized the public relations aspects of college publicity work and the need for the organization to raise its standards and educate college executives.

"Before us lies the task of making the college or university news bureau one of the most important arms in activities of higher education," he declared. "I believe that the publicity director should be one of the most influential men of his institution. He cannot do this if he contents himself with being merely a reporter of the news of his college. He must be a thinker, a creator of ideas. He must keep at least three or four laps ahead of the administration of his institution in initiative in making his institution favorably known. To do this he must see or devise means of getting his institution to 'do things' worthwhile, for the best publicity, remember, is based on things done, not on the routine of college life, or on the chance occurrences of such life. The publicity director, therefore, must be a man or woman of real vision, seeking and finding opportunities for development for his college or university."[19]

Concerning the need to educate executives to see the possibilities of proper publicity, Kirkwood said: "These leaders in education must be taught that publicity is not merely a thing of selling something--of advertising. They must be taught that it is a matter of molding public opinion through every worthy agency. The college and the university are themselves publicity agencies, giving publicity to the means of better living and service. . . . The whole problem of college and university publicity is to establish and maintain [our] institutions in right relationships with the people. This our executives must be made to see.[20]

"We have made a beginning . . . but there is much yet to be done," Kirkwood said in conclusion. "Our great work is ahead, and it is a great work, one which should appeal to our imagination and quicken our pulse. We cannot do it individually. We can do it in cooperation. In union there is strength—strength not only for the individual, but for the organization, and good for the cause of higher education."[21]

Activities and Influence Grow

When Frank Elliott assumed the presidency of AACNB in June, 1925, he set two major objectives for his administration: (1) to expand the Association's program to include all media of publicity, not just the newspaper, and (2) to move the annual convention out of the Chicago area and rotate it from year to year among different sections of the country.[22] Elliott also held that the Association's name should be changed to give a more accurate picture of the work its members were doing.

"We are called upon to do all sorts of services other than news reporting," he said in his address, "The President Looks Ahead," at the opening session of the 1926 convention. "We edit and publish bulletins, pamphlets, magazines, calendars, circulars, form letters, and all sorts of direct-mail publicity. We do paid advertising. We send out speakers and devote our own time to that most effective form of all publicity—direct personal contact."

Elliott also saw the publicity director and his job in even broader perspective, a perspective which would gain general acceptance only two decades later.

"The field of publicity is just about as wide as the foresight and energy of its director," he asserted. "He must be taken into account, therefore, by the educational administration if maximum publicity results are to be obtained. To map out policies affecting the public without consulting the publicity director is like organizing a force of traveling salesmen and then selling directly by mail. . . . In the face of this those of us who have the courage of our convictions insist that it is our business to aid everywhere in maintaining the best possible public relations for our respective institutions."

Emphasizing that the current name did not describe adequately the real work of Association members, Elliott suggested that "American Association of Educational Publicity" would be a better name than the one then in use. The report on proceedings for the 1926 convention says that a committee was appointed to consider a name change, but nowhere in the records is such a committee listed.[23] It was not until three years later, records indicate, that dissatisfaction with the original name had become sufficiently strong to warrant the appointment of a committee to consider other options.

Up to the time Elliott became president of AACNB in 1925, the Association had not ventured as far as 300 miles from Chicago to hold a meeting. Four of the eight meetings had been held in the Windy City, two in Madison, Wisconsin, and one in Evanston. The other convened in St. Louis. Moreover, the 1926 convention was being planned for Lafayette, Indiana. Most of AACNB's members, Elliott could point out, came from the Midwest. This fact strengthened his argument that the Association needed to move farther afield if it hoped to be regarded as a national organization.

The Hoosier publicist consequently made a strong plea at the 1926 convention, and Kansas State Agricultural College at Manhattan was selected as the 1927 conference site.

"All of us knew," Elliott explained later, "this would probably mean a sacrifice in numbers attending, but we were willing to pay the price for the benefits of seeing new faces from other areas and of spreading the influence of the Association geographically."

Not until 1933 did the convention go back to Chicago. Meanwhile, the wisdom of Elliott's arguments had been proven by the Association's growth to 220 members before the Great Depression struck. After the Kansas meeting, the number attending the annual conventions also increased annually as meetings were held in Ohio, New York, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Another result of the convention's geographical expansion was the regional organization plan adopted in 1931. Elliott was elected vice president in charge of this new facet of activity.[24]

The first draft of Standards of Practice requested by Kirkwood's Committee on the Future of the Association in 1924 was presented as a major order of business as the 1926 convention opened with Elliott in the chair. With John E. Stempel of Lafayette College as chairman, the committee had drawn an eleven-point code devoted entirely to duties, do's, and don'ts for the college news bureau.

Extensive discussion convinced the delegates that the code was not broad enough. They wanted one that included such things as a definition of news, qualifications of news directors, and relations of the news director to his institution and the press. They therefore adopted as a "temporary code" seven points from the one in hand and asked that work be continued on the project and a report made at the 1927 convention. The "temporary code" and its successors emphasized that the news bureau director should conduct himself "with due regard for the principles generally recognized in journalistic codes of ethics such as that of the American Society of Newspaper Editors," and "should as an individual subscribe particularly to those parts of such codes as relate to the responsibility, sincerity, truthfulness, accuracy, and respect for decency of the individual journalist."[25]

The publicity clinic introduced by Kirkwood as a feature of the 1925 convention was continued by Elliott in 1926 with such success that the next four national conferences also gave it major attention. In all cases the clinic was conducted by newspaper editors, using actual copy from AACNB members to point up weaknesses (and occasionally strengths) of stories being sent to them.

"Our members in 1925-27 were, generally speaking, young people—mainly recent college graduates in their twenties who had caught the eyes of their college presidents through their publicity enterprise on campus publications and in other ways," Elliott reminisced twenty-five years later.

"Since college publicity was such a new field and its workers were generally so young and short on experience in the years 1925-27 and yet so eager to learn, one chief aim of our officers [AACNB] was to stress the news clinic. Members were urged to bring in copy, lay it on the table, and have it analyzed then and there . . . by experienced news editors who would say right out whether or not they could or would use the copy and if not, why not."[26]

The 1926 convention also saw AACNB including sports publicity in its program for the first time. It was an innovation which caught the interest of a sizeable group of members and led to the creation in 1931 of a vice presidency for athletic publicity. A section of the annual meetings of AACNB and later of ACPA and ACPRA was consequently devoted to sports until 1958. At that time members of the Association interested primarily in sports decided that their interests could be served better by the College Sports Information Directors of America

(CoSida), which had been founded the year before.

As a result of other recommendations made by the Committee on the Future of the Association at the convention two years earlier, an extensive report on use of radio for publicity purposes was given by Douglass Miller.

Basing his report on information received through a questionnaire authorized by the Research Committee, Miller revealed that radio publicity, far from being on the wane as earlier believed, was receiving increased attention. The first newscast heard in the country had been aired by Station *8MK* (now WWJ) in Detroit on August 31, 1920.[27] Now, six years later, at least thirty-nine of the nation's colleges and universities owned and operated their own stations. Many others were cooperating with commercial stations. Music and information programs appeared to be among the most popular, but lectures which later would be described as "continuing education" were also gaining in popularity. Other programs ran the gamut from athletic events to chapel services and bed-time stories.[28]

In part because of Miller's survey, AACNB and its successor organizations thereafter gave attention to radio as a publicity medium, first in their programs for national meetings, then also in those for regional meetings held after 1931.

Revealing that the treasury contained only ninety-five cents as the convention opened, Secretary-Treasurer Tom Johnston recommended that the Association's dues be raised to $5 from the $2 levied annually since 1917. After a special committee appointed to discuss the financial problem had supported Johnston's recommendation, the convention in its final session raised the dues. Fourteen members paid at once and the treasury was later able to show a balance of $62.16.

Convention expenses for 1926, including those for outside speakers, had been $8.79![29]

It was revealed later that Johnston had advanced $100 out of his own pocket to enable the Association to print the proceedings of the 1925 convention before enough money was received from dues to cover the printer's bill.[30]

Elliott, whose broad-gauge perspective and objectives had fired the imaginations of the thirty-six delegates attending the convention at Purdue, was reelected president. Johnston was elevated to the vice presidency and Maynard W. Brown of Kansas State Agricultural College was named secretary-treasurer.[31]

Brown soon began issuing The AACNB *Correspondence Clinic,* a mimeographed periodical devoted largely to brief items about individuals, unusual activities and publications, tips on jobs, lists of persons who had paid their dues and information on the convention to be held in Manhattan, Kansas, on June 23-25, 1927. It also included the questionnaires being circulated by the Research Committee to get formation for its reports which by now had become major subjects for discussions at conventions.

Most important of all, however, it published the AACNB Constitution for the first time. The origin of the constitution is still cloaked in mystery. Frankenberg, in some of his correspondence following the founding meeting and in one of his earlier talks before AACNB, had said that those present at the founding meeting in 1917 had adopted a constitution. No copy is known to exist, however, and no mention of a constitution except that made by Frankenberg can be found in mimeographed materials circulated prior to 1923.

In 1923 Frankenberg had written a Statement of Purpose for the Association at President Kirkwood's request. It was circulated with an introductory phrase, "The constitution of the American Association of College News Bureau provides." Then followed a twenty-five-word sentence giving the purpose of the orgainzation: "The purpose of this organization is to bring together College News Editors or other representatives interested in the news services of American Colleges and Universities."[32]

Also implying that the constitution was not of recent origin was the paragraph which preceded presentation of the constitution in the March 1,1927, issue of the AACNB *Correspondence Clinic:* "As some of the new members of the American Association of College News Bureaus may not be acquainted with the details provided for in the constitution of the organization, we are running it in this newsletter at the suggestion of President Elliott."

The constitution as then printed was a simple, seven-article document covering name, purpose, membership, officers, meetings, dues, and amendments in 314 words. The purpose of the organization was stated in Article II in exactly the same words Frankenberg had used in his 1923 statement of purpose. The article on membership, indicating that any college or university in the United States or Canada was eligible, also included another fact which Frankenberg had emphasized in correspondence following the founding meeting. It asserted that membership was to be held by institutions rather than by individuals.[33] The constitution printed in March, 1927, also stated that dues "shall be two dollars, payable in advance," but a footnote indicated that the amount had been changed to $5 in 1926.

In light of Frankenberg's early statements and the fact that the Statement of Purpose he prepared in 1923 phrased the Association's purpose in exactly the same words used in the 1927 copy, it seems reasonably safe to presume that the founding group did draw a constitution and that it was printed for the first time a decade later, rather casually in a newsletter.

As anticipated when AACNB voted to go outside the Chicago area for its convention, attendance at the Manhattan conference was smaller than usual. But there were many new faces—nineteen among the twenty-four registrants. Moreover, only sixty-five persons had paid the $5 dues for 1926-27.[34] Among the new members, however, were two men, John P. DeCamp of the University of Cincinnati and Earl Reed Silvers of Rutgers University, who would become president of the Association within a decade.[35]

The Standards of Practice introduced at the 1926 convention were presented in completely revised form by the committee headed by John Stempel. Although the new statement included the items members had found missing from the original statement, the delegates were still not satisfied. The Committee on Standards of Practice, now headed by DeCamp, was charged with bringing to the 1928 convention yet another revision with final action anticipated. It had been decided also that this committee would not consider a change in name for the Association as suggested earlier but would leave this to the convention or a special committee.[36]

One of the Research Committee questionnaires circulated through the AACNB *Correspondence Clinic* was meant to provide a better picture of the activities of publicity departments in educational institutions. The findings reported at the convention revealed that publicity directors were more than news writers at many institutions.

In some cases, the survey showed, publicity directors were serving in one or more additional capacities, such as editors of publications, advertising managers, radio program directors, concert booking agents, admissions solicitors, alumni secretaries, assistant coaches, motion picture operators, state fair exhibitors, and instructors on the faculty.[37]

The delegates continued a policy started during the 1926 convention when the delegates took time off from businesss to journey fifty miles to Hazelden, summer home of famed George Ade. The 1927 convention program provided for a trip to Fort Riley for half a day's session. There the group not only toured the fort but saw a horse show, exhibitions of rough rider and driving drill, and a film, "Life of Riley," and heard two addresses related to news and ROTC units.

The election of officers elevated Maynard W. Brown of the host institution to the presidency and made Ralph S. Clark of Carnegie Institute of Technology and Marie Dickore of the College of Music of Cincinnati, vice president and secretary-treasurer, repectively.[38] Nineteen cities, including Havana, Cuba, and Toronto and Montreal, Canada, bid for the 1928 convention. Cincinnati was chosen after DeCamp and Miss Dickore presented personal invitations.

Delegates to the convention left for home, still mulling over the words of their retiring president:

"But educational publicity does not come by mere chance. It comes because somebody in the university or college is doing something, because somebody is planning something, because somebody is experimenting and making a success of it, because somebody is exercising a free play of brains and energy, because education really means something. . . .

"So . . . let us keep clearly in mind that while education in itself creates, educational publicity re-creates, propagates, and disseminates. Let us remember that we are the teachers off the campus. While our friends on the faculty . . . are instructing perhaps a hundred a day, we are teaching literally hundreds of thousands 365 days a year.[39]

Standards Of Practice Adopted

The high-quality leadership provided by Kirkwood and Elliott during the preceding five years was continued by AACNB's presidents between 1927 and 1930. Thus the organization rounded out its first full decade of unbroken activity not only with its membership nearly trebled but, just as important, with the values of its members' work receiving wide-spread recognition on campus and off.

In Maynard W. Brown, president for 1927-28, AACNB had a leader whose capacity had carried him into the top office only two years after he attended his first convention at Madison, Wisconsin. The thirty-one-year-old Brown was an energetic bachelor, the first of several who would serve in the presidency during the next decade. Although handicapped physically by wounds received in both knees during a skirmish with an outlaw band while serving in the U. S. Cavalry on the Mexican border in 1917, Brown refused to let the injury slow his work pace.[40] In a day when letter writing sans secretary was commonplace, Brown during his year in office wrote 530 letters to prospective members and to fellow officers and committee members with a view toward making the upcoming 1928 convention at the University of Cincinnati in April the best yet.[41]

Meanwhile, the AACNB *Correspondence Clinic* became a regular monthly publication for the first time with Marie Dickore, Association secretary, as editor. The November, 1927, issue became the first press-printed news publication in the Association's history. Tradition has it that Vice President Ralph Clark made this possible by arranging to have some of the advanced students at Carnegie Tech do the job as a printing project.

The 8½×11 single sheet issue was printed front and back with two wide columns to the page. It included two bylined articles under a new feature, "Other Men—Other Methods," a message from Brown, items on recommended readings, notes about members and a questionnaire to establish the convention date.[42] Starting with the January, 1928, issue the title of the publication was changed to AACNB *News Letter*.

Relatively speaking, the increase in membership and in convention attendance during Brown's administration was large: twenty-eight percent in membership (from sixty-five to eighty-three) and sixty-two percent (from twenty-four to thirty-nine) in the attendance. But it was the convention program which proved to be a triumph for Brown. With Miss Dickore and a new member of AACNB, John P. DeCamp of the University of Cincinnati, directing preparations, the program included thirty-one addresses and papers, plus reports of officers and committees. Even after careful editing, the printed report of the convention ran seventy-six pages, nearly twice as many as in any previous year.

Setting the tone for the convention in the presidential address, Brown told his colleagues that "we have hardly scratched the surface in really interpreting news."

"It is our duty," he said, "to take the results of scientific findings or investigations, to take the message of the sociologist, the teacher of home economics, the forward-looking educator, or any other educational leader, and so strip that message of technical terms, of verbal persiflage, and redundance that he who runs may read . . . it is a task in which we in the past have lamentably failed—failed chiefly, I think, because we have been contented to take the sensational news, the catch phrase, the surface features, and pat ourselves on the back when those words of so-called educational news received glaring headlines in the press."

Brown, who was eager to see a strong Standards of Practice adopted, pointed out that "we have been damned by many newspapers and by many of our own profession because some of the college news writers have overdone the sensational, have been press agents rather than interpreters, and have sent inaccurate, propaganda-filled, wordily-written stories to newspaper desks. . . .

"I hope," he said, "that in the future we can work as a body as well as individuals in keeping out of our services stories which give an undue emphasis to the trashy and frothy and sensational parts of college life and in giving more of our time to the vast volume of interpretative news which only needs to be translated to become immensely interesting to the American public."[43]

Almost one-third of the convention report was devoted to four studies conducted by the Research Committee headed by Vice President Clark. Past President Frank Elliott, in a study of movies in educational publicity, discovered that only twenty-three of thirty-five member institutions responding were using moving pictures, although the American public had come to regard the cinema as a routine part of their weekly schedules. About half of the college movies then in use were "home produced." Most featured athletics, alumni activities, and commencements. So new were they as a publicity medium that many newspapers welcomed stories about students from their area who appeared in campus movies.[44]

Forty-seven colleges had responded to the study E. C. Lytton of Drake University made on "The Organization of the Adequate and Ideal College News Bureau." Only six had established their news bureaus before World War I. The average number of years the institutions had had news bureaus was 6.6. Only twenty-four of the colleges had full-time directors for their bureaus. Average salary for these directors was $3,062.[45]

Few institutions were using outdoor advertising and many opposed it, Clark said, in reporting on a survey made on the use of that medium.

"There seems to be no tendency among colleges to use outdoor advertising for purposes other than to announce athletics, dramatics, exhibits, concerts, and special student activities," he concluded. He added that, when used, outdoor advertising most often took the form of posters.[46]

A study by Edmund S. Carpenter of Marquette University concerning the attitudes of newspaper editors toward college publicity revealed that they "welcome legitimate college news, . . . appreciate the work . . . college news bureaus are doing, and would like to see an even further development of this source of material."[47]

The survey, which Carpenter said covered major papers in all sections of the nation, included pointed comments from some editors.

"The news bureaus are valuable," said Henry Justin Smith, managing editor of the Chicago *Daily News*, " when they seek consistently for news values, especially in the scientific field, and when they cling to a policy of friendly cooperation with editors. A college news bureau man who tries to block news effort is a tactless idiot." Smith's comment was especially well taken because he had once been news director at the University of Chicago.

Another well-known managing editor commented, "College news bureaus are too likely merely to scratch the surface; to send the banal and overlook the vast mines of interesting articles or stories that could be dug out of their scientific and research laboratories. . . . Also, college news bureaus should be as agile in getting unfavorable facts as in getting favorable facts. No newspaper much cares for 'handouts' that are censored or dictated by a college."[48]

Representatives of the press associations and the weekly press were heard at an AACNB convention for the first time in Cincinnati. Without exception their addresses reflected the opinions Carpenter had secured in his survey. R. B. Howard, publisher of the *Madison Press* at London, Ohio, criticized college news bureaus for "sending out too much stuff" and for failure to "get into more intimate touch with the editors."

"College publicity directors," declared William C. Pryor of the Associated Press, "are about the only press agents—if you'll forgive the word—who aren't in bad with editors before they start. And a lot of them proceed to sink themselves by frequent flowery and complimentary allusions to the schools that pay them. . . .

"Leave your office," Pryor advised, "and go seek out the metallurgists, the mineralogists, geologists, biologists, zoologists, chemists, physicists, and other experimenters in their laboratories before, between, or after classes. Trace the unobtrusive psychologist to his lair, and visit with the professor of education and the head of the household economics department. You may not get a story the first time, but you'll get acquainted and that's a start."

Pryor concluded with a statement which implied, as other editors had implied or in a few cases charged, that some college publicists of the day were inclined to cover up news which might put their institutions or people in a bad light.

"And I would not," he said, "cover up news of any sort that broke on the campus, whether suicides, scandals, expulsions, or other news of an unfortunate type. These things will get out anyhow, usually in a distorted form, and the college and the individuals will suffer less if they are given out frankly. No editor would knowingly injure any college or person, but they do want the news, and a sane, frank statement from the college itself will often prevent publication of extravagant sensational yarns."[49]

Some members of AACNB were also criticizing the job being done by colleagues. Typical was the comment of Ralph P. Crawford of the University of Nebraska. "Too many of the efforts of university news bureaus are devoted to athletic and social publicity," he said in an address on "Popularizing a University's Serious Work." "The side shows, because of their spectacular nature, receive the publicity, while the show in the big tent is neglected."[50]

Delegates saw indications that some college publicists were, indeed, inadequately prepared for their jobs and consequently were sometimes hurting the entire profession by covering up bad stories, overplaying the trivial, and writing in hyperbole. Therefore adoption of the long-discussed Standards of Practice was the major action taken by the convention delegates. Written and rewritten annually since 1926 the Standards of Practice in its final form was the work of a three-man committee headed by Laurence B. Smelser of Vanderbilt University.

Basically the same as the code put before the 1927 convention, except for some reordering and a few changes in terms, the Standards of Practice emphasized that "quality rather than quantity in production should be the aim of the news director."

The new code emphasized that AACNB accepted such codes of ethics as that of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It also defined educational news, sketched qualifications of news directors, and enumerated acceptable relations of the news director to his institution and to the press.

"College news should be news and not propaganda," the code emphasized. . . . [It] should be free from direct or implied discrimination against any other college. Undue self-praise should be avoided. No facts concerning the institution should be concealed from interested persons or organizations because they are unfavorable. The success of an institution's news service is to be measured, not by the amount of newspaper space it commands, but by the completeness and fairness of the record of the institution's life which is published, and the significance of the facts which are placed before the public."[51]

Published in pamphlet form soon after the convention, the Standards of Practice were supplied to all persons affiliated with the Association beween 1928 and 1941. At that time a new code was adopted to cover the enlarged field of members' activities.

For the first time AACNB members at Cincinnati were offered a style sheet for college newsletters. Coming in answer to a frequently expressed need, the style guide was presented by Grace Walker of the University of California at Berkeley.[52]

Pointing out that the work of AACNB laid a heavy burden on the president and secretary-treasurer, Miss Dickore in her secretary's report recommended that the organization henceforth have an active standing committee on membership. President Brown added in his report that "a fault of our association is that too much detailed work devolves upon the officers." The action suggested was taken by Ralph Clark following his election to the presidency for 1928-29 and was credited with the sixty-one percent growth in membership recorded for the year.

The need to cut the 1928 convention report to seventy-six pages resulted in the omission of the membership roster, a fact which leaves the Association today with no membership record for 1927-28. Also omitted was a record of changes made in the constitution. After Secretary Dickore on the first day of the convention reported that "the constitution is in sad need of repairs," President Brown appointed a three-man committee headed by Clark to bring in suggested revisions at the final convention session. Miss Dickore had said that the Association needed especially to establish its fiscal year and the length of tenure for its officers. Minutes for the Saturday session say that the committee's report was discussed and adopted.[53]

The revisions to the constitution do not appear in the proceedings but were recorded in the *News Letter* for April 21. They called for the fiscal year to run from July 1 to June 30 and for the officers elected at the annual convention to take office at the beginning of the fiscal year. Other revisions called for an Executive Committee (the three officers) to direct the disbursement of Association funds and empowered the president to appoint necessary committees.[54]

Unfortunately, these revisions were overlooked when the constitution was next printed in the March, 1930, issue of the *News Letter*, the wording then being identical with that published in March, 1927.

Nearly half a hundred cities extended invitations but Nashville, Tennessee, was selected as the 1929 convention site. John DeCamp of the University of Cincinnati and Laurence Smelser of Vanderbilt University were elected vice president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, to serve with President Clark on the Executive Committee.[55]

On the basis of convention discussions held on moving pictures, the delegates also passed a resolution "That, since the present trend of so-called 'college movies' misrepresents the spirit and objectives of college life, the AACNB offers its assistance to the various producing companies in issuing more accurate pictures of college life."[56]

In one of the final addresses at Cincinnati, pioneer public relations man Edward L. Bernays sought to raise the sights of the delegates even further.

"I feel that 'college news bureau' and 'director' do not as terms imply the functions that rightfully belong to them," he said in speaking for the second time before an AACNB convention [1922 was the first]. "The office and the officer fulfill a broader function than the name. They are and should be known as counsels on public relations to colleges."

Explaining his statement, Bernays emphasized that the college news bureau has a function beyond that of "giving out truthful, accurate information to those media which might be able to use it."

"To me," he asserted, "the second function of the college news bureau is the more important. It is that of helping to interpret the public's attitude to the college authorities in the light of what the college's aims are and to suggest modifications of the college's internal policies, if they do not conform to its own ideas and ideals."[57]

Search For a Better Name

New President Ralph Clark assumed office July 1. He resolved to enlarge the membership, increase the activities of the employment clearing house, intensify research, and make the 1929 convention in Nashville the best yet held by the organization.

A bundle of energy, Clark had been a member of AACNB since being assigned to Carnegie Tech in 1921 by a New York firm engaged to direct the institute's publicity efforts. Shortly afterward, Clark became a member of the Carnegie Tech staff as assistant to the president and manager of the press and service bureau. His broad experience immediately gained him the responsibility of conversing daily with President Thomas Stockham Baker.

"I remember that Mr. Clark was on the list of persons summoned by the President the first thing each morning," a secretary in Dr. Baker's office recalled later. "Dr. Baker was not one to keep his publicity man in the dark about what was going on. He had the most fully-developed public relations sense of any administrator I ever knew. . . . Whether he learned from Ralph or vice versa I can't say."[58]

From the beginning of his membership in the Association Clark had been a leader. He took part in most of the annual convention programs, served as a member of the committee which drew the first draft of the Association's Standards of Practice in 1926, then headed the Research Committee for two years while also serving as vice president of the organization.

Implementing the recommendation made by Secretary Dickore and President Brown in their 1927-28 report, Clark appointed a twenty-one-man membership committee. The wisdom of this action was proven when the Association's membership climbed from eighty-three to 134. To help the committee in its work, Clark wrote and published (supposedly through the cooperation of Carnegie Tech's Printing Department) an eight-page brochure, "Some Facts About AACNB." The first piece in Association history printed to help publicize the organization itself, the brochure included paragraphs on "What It Is," "Who May Join," "Dues," "Employment Clearing House," "What the AACNB Does," "Convention Proceedings," "Standards of Practice," and a list of member institutions which at that time totaled ninety.

Clark personally managed the employment clearing house, giving attention to publicity jobs open and to job seekers alike. He also took the lead in building a comprehensive program for the annual convention scheduled for April 11-13, 1929. It was advertised with a six-page edition of the *News Letter*, issued from Pittsburgh under the label of "Convention Special." Speakers listed on the program as of that date, he announced, represented fourteen states.[59]

The germ of the central office idea, which developed gradually in the late 1930s and became a major project of the Association before its achievement in 1950, surfaced in the *News Letter* for April 2, 1929. In a front page letter to "Dear Patient Friends," Secretary-Treasurer Smelser, swamped with his publicity job in Vanderbilt's one-man office, the increasing duties of secretary-treasurer, and the need to arrange local details as convention host, wrote: "Your secretary-treasurer shall hereafter be a man who is wrapped up heart and soul in its work and maybe keep him there permanently, paying from the Treasury enough to remunerate a clerk for handling routine details, and leaving him free to edit the *News Letter* and do planning for programs."

Smelser sought to introduce a new feature into the convention—dancing after the annual dinner. Announcing that the Fisk University Octette would provide music at the dinner, he said in the March issue of the *News Letter*: "If many of you want a dance the night after the banquet, please let me know. Nashville has more pretty girls to the square inch than any other city. And they are prettier to the square inch than elsewhere."[60] Although three addresses followed the banquet, the convention report indicated that some delegates had accepted Smelser's invitation. One sentence in the summary of convention activities read: "Selections by the Fisk University Double Quartette and social dancing rounded out an evening of rare pleasure."[61]

In his address opening the convention, President Clark expressed belief that it was time for higher education and educational publicity directors to pause for some soul searching.

"What are we trying to do? What do we hope to do?" he asked, "Are we, as publicity directors, on the right track or should we pause and consider our direction? . . . I call for a careful consideration of educational publicity with the possible view of defining a new concept. . . .

"It is an easy matter to place several interpretations upon our work as directors of publicity for educational institutions," he continued. "Some of us admit that we are trying to make our institutions better known to the general public for such purposes as attracting endowment, establishing prestige for our alumni, attracting better, if not more students, and more broadly, to 'sell' higher education. And, occasionally, we justify our efforts by saying that we are helping to increase the influence and facilities of a public service. . . .

"I do not have even a remote suggestion of approach to support my plea for a new concept. I merely throw this out to you as a question to be retained in your mind. I would ask you, however, to be thinking of the social consequences of education and of educational publicity. Recent phenomena in stock market operations have already given sociologists and economists justifiable cause for alarm. They are asking: 'What will be the social consequences of it all?' . . . It seems to me that a parallel situation exists in relation to higher education. What will be the social consequences of higher education upon society?

". . . The society of the future must mark carefully the niche wherein higher education is to be fitted. And, as far as the future is concerned, our responsibilities as educational publicity directors must be considered in the light of a new concept as well as of present-day methods of office routine, fund-raising campaigns, enrollment drives, and propaganda as used in its most respectable dress."[62]

Under the direction of Vice President DeCamp research had continued to be a major project of the Association. Almost a quarter of the 1929 convention report—fifteen of sixty-eight pages—was devoted to reports on "Scientific News and the College Press Bureau," and "The Values of Photographs in Publicity and Stunt Publicity." A study on "Methods of Interesting Men of Means in Making Gifts and Bequests" had also been proposed but failed to materialize just as it did when suggested in each of the succeeding two years.

Taking up nearly ten pages of the convention report, the coverage given scientific news under the direction of DeCamp himself was the most comprehensive on that subject ever given at an Association convention. Based on information secured from college newsmen, scientists, and science editors, it provided members with comprehensive "how to" and "how not to" guidelines.[63]

"Stunt publicity was looked upon with the blackest of frowns," Marie Kirkwood of Western Reserve reported in presenting her study on that subject. She had started, she said, with a definition all too broad: "A stunt is something that is made to happen," but later decided that "we must narrow the definition and consider a stunt as the staged and, more or less, stagey performance whose only mission is that of being an attention attracter." On the basis of this definition, several delegates, "disapproving and disclaiming stunts," said they did not have to consider such activities [because] "their campus offered such a wealth of genuine, and presumably dignified feature material."[64]

A recent survey on the use of motion pictures, much more comprehensive than that made by Frank Elliott during the previous year, had shown that fifty-seven, or twenty-five percent, of 225 responding colleges and universities were using amateur motion pictures. However, Herbert L. Connelly of Wesleyan University revealed that many institutions still questioned their value. Neither Harvard nor Princeton, for instance, was among the users and the latter questioned the use of movies as a publicity medium in view of the expense involved. Yale, while a user, said it did not know whether movies were worth the time and money they cost. How untried movies were as a publicity medium was emphasized by the reply of one publicist: "Our office has never before thought of or heard of this use of the movies."[65]

The country was at the peak of a boom period as the 1929 convention program was being planned. Many colleges and universities were conducting or considering war memorial building campaigns. Belief that AACNB's members would have to play a greater role in the fund-raising efforts of their institutions led Clark to secure representatives of two major fund-raising firms as speakers at Nashville.

John Price Jones, president of the corporation bearing his name, emphasized the publicity man's importance in fund raising and shared with the delegates some of his own philosophy.

"The purpose of the publicity man and the foundation of a publicity department, is to be constructive, to be creative, to have a purpose behind each piece of publicity he puts out," Jones asserted. "The first step in making your publicity department constructive is by analyzing not merely your job, but the institution with which you are connected."[66]

Jones said that he regarded organization and publicity as the *sine qua non* of a successful fund-raising campaign, then concluded: "But publicity that goes back to getting the facts, analyzing them and creating ideas is absolutely the most important in any organization, or in public relations . . . of any college or institution. It is a type of leadership, and I think that it is a big job. Any man who works that way and can develop ideas deserves to sit in on a meeting of the Board of Directors and deserves to sit at the right hand of the President."[67]

There were claims that some colleges continued to suppress news of unfavorable happenings, despite the wide dissemination of AACNB's Standards of Practice to members and nonmembers alike. So a hard-hitting address made by Robert W. Madry of the University of North Carolina received national coverage.

"Real news cannot be suppressed," Madry declared. "It will out, regardless of the attempts of college officials toward suppression . . . and once newspapers learn that an institution is trying to suppress a story, the chances are nine out of ten that they will give that particular story a much bigger play than they would have had it been given to the papers when it first broke.

"Moreover, as one newspaper editorial writer recently pointed out, an unfavorable news story published 'does not do one iota as much harm to an institution as does the whispered word passing from mouth to mouth and becoming distorted with each telling. . . . Rumors are bound to be exaggerated and they do much greater injury than facts placed in cold type where all may read'.

"Any educational institution that adopts a policy of noncensorship of news is certain to get unfavorable publicity now and then," Madry concluded, "but, if the institution is making real progress, the favorable publicity will, in the long run, more than offset the unfavorable kind. A spirit of frankness and fair play—that is what the public and the press have a right to expect of the college news bureaus."[68]

Frank Elliott, who two years earlier had urged the Association to change its name to one indicating the broad field of educational publicity in which its members worked, again proposed such a change. He pointed out that more than half of the 1929 convention program was devoted to subjects other than news bureau work. Also, he continued, the Association's founding father, T. T. Frankenberg, had said in addressing the convention's first session, "Some of us [back in 1917] held out for a type of blatant honesty and wished to be known as college publicity workers. A more conservative judgment prevailed, however, and the term 'News Bureau' was adopted."

"The present title is misleading and gives educational administrators a wrong impression of the scope of educational publicity," Elliott declared in arguing for the name change. "They are led to believe that, as long as their colleges maintain an effective news bureau, nothing else need be done. This impression has been reflected almost without exception by the university and college executives who have appeared on the Association's programs during recent years."

Elliott, himself a news bureau director, said that news bureau work should not be scorned—that it was basic and must come first.

"But over and above that are many other means of maintaining favorable publicity for schools and colleges," he said. "Radio, movies, exhibits, direct-mail circulars of information, paid advertising, and various other publicity practices can be pointed out as proof that the Association's work has now far outgrown the field of the news bureau and should be known also for the other work it does."

Elliott suggested three possible comprehensive names for the Association—American Association for Educational Publicity, American Association of Educational Publicity Directors, and American Council on Educational Publicity.[69]

President Clark appointed a committee with Elliott, as chairman, and asked Kenneth O. Hezzelwood of Hamline University and John DeCamp to canvass the situation and present a report later. The committee met immediately following the convention and agreed shortly that the words "American" and "association" should be retained. The word "educational" was not acceptable because it did not signify that the Association's work was in higher education.

Initially the word "publicity" was considered unacceptable "because of the evil connotation which, in many quarters at least, seemed to be associated with the term." The committee began to look with more favor on the term after it was pointed out that the word was regaining lost prestige and also that it was the most significant term that could be used in advertising the activities of the Association. "Public relations" and "public information" were terms suggested as possible alternatives to the word "publicity." The committee finally agreed that the entire membership should be canvassed for suggestions. A new name could then be determined by a referendum vote or by majority action at the next convention.[70]

The Nominating Committee at the convention presented a slate including Edmund S. Carpenter of Marquette University for president; Earl Reed Silvers of Rutgers University for vice president, and Don M. Cresswell of Pennsylvania State College for secretary-treasurer. It also recommended revision of the constitution to provide for a fourth officer, convention secretary and host; backed the bid of New York University for the 1930 convention; and suggested that Henry C. Hathaway of that institution become convention secretary.

Clark was nominated from the floor for a second term as president but declined. It was fortunate for the Association that he did. Clark left his news bureau post at Carnegie Tech four months later to join Tamblyn and Brown, a New York fund raising firm. The delegates approved the proposed amendment to the constitution and elected the slate nominated by the committee.[71]

Less than a week after the national convention, about thirty west coast news bureau directors held a one-day meeting at the University of Southern California. The conference pointed out the value of regional conclaves, especially for AACNB members and other college news bureau men located so far distant that attendance at the national meeting would absorb a large part of their budgets. Known at first as the Pacific and Far West News Bureau Directors, the coast group named as its president Maynard W. Brown, AACNB's immediate past president, who had become professor of journalism and news bureau director at Oregon State in the fall of 1927. Four months later Brown left Oregon State to become head of the Journalism Department at Marquette and was succeeded as president by Harold Ellis, who thirteen years later would become the Association's first president from the Far West.

The meeting of the west coast group had a major bearing on the future of the Association. The value of the regional type of organization was recognized in 1931 and during the Great Depression would be the activity that did most to keep the Association alive.

Another pioneering action was recorded in relation to the meeting of the west coast directors. Travel by plane was sufficiently novel in 1929 that the report of the meeting made special mention of the fact that the University of Washington's representative had used this means of transportation for his round-trip to Los Angeles.[72]

The Broader View Prevails

Edmund G. Carpenter, AACNB's president in 1929-30, was a gregarious bachelor with four major interests. The first was Marquette University whose news bureau he had founded as a senior in 1923 and would head for forty-three years to establish a record for service in such a post with a single institution. The second was sports of all kinds, and the Marquette football team especially. The third was motoring, a hobby he had started early enough to break his right arm twice cranking a Model T Ford.[73] And the fourth was AACNB and its successor associations in which he was a leader for more than four decades. "Ted Carpenter," it was said, "was a newspaperman's publicity man."[74]

The most important action taken during the year was the change of name to American College Publicity Association (ACPA). In December Frank Elliott reported that his committee had received forty-eight suggestions for a new name and that the committee would shortly make a report to members through the *News Letter*.

In the March issue the committee reported that twenty-eight of the suggested names had included the term "publicity" or "publicist" and therefore the committee, with the unanimous approval of the Exective Committee, was proposing that the organization adopt American College Publicity Association as its new name. A postcard ballot was included with the *News Letter*. The vote was strongly in favor of the proposed name, and consequently the annual convention at New York University in April was held under the new name.

A review of the names suggested indicates that even at that early date the term "public relations" was considered best by some practitioners. Among the names suggested were American Association of Public Relations of Colleges, Public Relations Council of American Colleges, Council on College Public Relations, American Association of College Public Relations Bureaus, and National Association of College Public Relations Counsels.[75]

The March *News Letter* also carried the Association constitution. It was just a duplicate of the one published in March, 1927, except that the 1929 amendment providing for a convention secretary was included. Omitted by oversight were the amendments setting the fiscal year and tenure of officers adopted at the 1928 convention but overlooked in publication of that year's convention proceedings.[76]

A second major action in 1929-30 was the cooperation of AACNB with the Association of American Colleges to provide an educational publicity exhibit for the latter's convention in Washington, D.C., January 14-16. AAC's invitation for AACNB to provide such an exhibit marked the beginning of the cooperative effort which twenty years later provided a central office for AACNB (by that time renamed the American College Public Relations Association) in the same building with AAC. Although AACNB members had only ten days in which to transport their materials to Washington, they responded with such enthusiasm that an exhibit of twenty-three categories, ranging from catalogs and viewbooks to novelties such as blotters, calendars, postcards, and tire covers, was provided. The exhibit material from approximately 100 institutions was then shipped to New York University where it was on display during the ACPA convention, April 17-19.[77]

The value of cooperative effort in other areas was also becoming evident to leaders in the college publicity field. Early in January, Louis C. Boochever of Cornell, soon to become president of ACPA, advocated "an intercollegiate alumni fund roll call or a nationwide college drive which might parallel the National Red Cross Week."[78] At its convention in New York City three months later ACPA passed a resolution presented by Alvin C. Busse of New York University. It called for the Association to appoint a committee "to develop from its membership the scientific contributions of the colleges and universities to be written up in news stories for use in the newspapers of the country."

Both projects received extensive coverage in the New York *Times*. The newspaper reported Busse's proposal as an effort not only to show the scientific contributions of American colleges to humanity but also "to counteract a popular opinion that the college is a 'dormitory, a stadium, or a four-year tea party'."

"The college," the *Times* quoted Busse as saying, "should be known as the largest single contributor to the progress revealed in modern life through the efforts of its research men and women. No institutions have a better right to appreciation than the colleges and universities which have provided mankind with the telegraph, the camera, the dynamo, toxins and antitoxins, and thousands of fundamental discoveries."[79]

The need for educational interpretation was being recognized increasingly at this time. Declaring that "the advance of education literally waits on interpretation," Joy Elmer Morgan devoted two pages of the February, 1930, issue of *The Journal of the National Education Association* to an editorial titled "The Need for Educational Interpretation."

"Throughout the centuries," Morgan wrote, "civilization has been pushed forward by three men: the administrator who organizes and executes; the investigator who discovers and invents; and the interpreter who makes the purposes of the administrator and the results of the investigator's work the common property of mankind. . . . The one who is to administer, to do research, or to interpret must be a specialist if he is to meet the needs of the new world for experts who are masters."

Morgan declared that the social significance of interpretation was only beginning to be appreciated and that the need for responsible interpretation increases "in proportion as the areas of administration become larger and in proportion as research accomplishes its perfect work."

"It [interpretation] had little place in a civilization based on force," Morgan said. "It has a supreme place in a civilization whose ideal is democracy, where we wish people to govern themselves and to be governed from within by an intelligent appreciation of the values of life. . . . If education is to take its place as a determining factor in our democratic life it will be obliged to put more time and money into educational interpretation, which is not yet recognized to a point where adequate provision is made for it either in our thinking or in the budgets for institutions and school systems."

Morgan said that the specialist in educational interpretation should have four qualifications: (1) understanding of human nature in all its phases; (2) knowledge of the schools and his school; (3) understanding of the channels through which interpretation is carried on and the arts which are used therein; and (4) knowledge of civilization itself.[80]

The presidents of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada were likewise feeling a strong need for educational interpretation, Elliott reported at the convention at New York University. As one of the year's research projects, the views of over two hundred presidents on modern educational publicity had been secured. Of these 151 said educational publicity was essential, seventy-nine that it was desirable. Almost all said that such publicity should be provided by the colleges on their own initiative.

The presidents indicated seven goals which should be sought by educational publicity, with good will the most important. The others in order of listing were: increased enrollment, increased income, dissemination of information, increased endowment, new buildings, and increased gate receipts at university and college events.

Newspaper stories were held by the presidents to be the medium best suited for educational publicity. Other media, listed in order of descending importance, were: alumni publications, public addresses, direct mail, magazines, field agents, radio, exhibits, newspaper advertising, posters, movies, magazine advertising, window displays, and billboards.

The presidents regarded practical newspaper experience as the most important single qualification for educational publicity work, but nearly all of them thought the publicist should have at least a college education. Of eighty-five presidents who responded to the question, seventy-one held that the publicity director should do part-time teaching.

Only 157 presidents responded to a question about salary, but 112 of these thought that a well-qualified publicity director should be ranked in salary and prestige with a professor, dean or administrator. In the opinion of 132 of the presidents answering the question, publicity for intercollegiate athletics was being over emphasized.[81]

The college publicists also got a first-hand evaluation of their work from a college president when John M. Thomas of Rutgers University addressed the convention.

"If higher education is a favorite object of benevolence in the United States today, and indeed it is," he said, "it is because for a considerable period colleges have been entirely frank in taking the public into their confidence as to their endowments and resources, as to the expenditure of their funds in detail in various fields of investigation, research, and teaching. . . .

"I don't believe that any institution has a right to consider itself respectable that does not spread its affairs fully before the public, and similarly in academic affairs as to the educational practices, principles, and theories and ideas of its professors, and as to the worthwhile things . . . that are going on in its student body.

"There is no more important position [than that of the publicity man] around the campus anywhere," Thomas concluded. "It ought to be loyally supported. The publicity director . . . ought to stand in very close with the president and the president ought to reveal to him all his thought and all his heart with absolute confidence."[82]

Another featured speaker at the convention emphasized even more strongly the importance and responsibilities of the jobs being performed by ACPA members.

"Progress in the development of a college or university is dependent in the end on the nature of the institution's public relations," said Thomas E. Benner, visiting professor of education at Teachers College of Columbia University, in opening his address on "The College or University Public Relations Officer." "This," he continued, "implies a continuous process of adjustment between the institution and the public opinion of its constituency.

"Programs have been undertaken in the field of higher education whose certain failure might easily have been predicted by a good public relations officer, thoroughly familiar with the nature of public opinion in the constituency from which support was necessary. On the other hand, important projects have been postponed or abandoned because of an uninformed or misinformed public opinion whose hostility needed only suitable exposure to the facts to become converted into enthusiastic support,—as any capable public relations officer would have seen.

Benner in this address also emphasized a fact that was becoming increasingly clear to college publicists: that the job of interpretation is a two-way street.

". . . the success of a public relations officer," Benner asserted, "can not be measured in terms of the number of times per week that the name of his institution appears in the public press or in terms of the number of column inches of news space secured per month. . . . His success will be measured by the extent to which he is able to build up in the minds of his constituency a true picture of the institution he serves and the degree of accuracy with which he is able to judge what programs a constituency can be brought to support when placed in possession of the facts. This requires the authority and the facilities for using all those devices which will contribute to creating a public opinion ever more closely in accord with reality, for preventing those mistakes which so often create opinions contrary to the facts, and for constantly interpreting and reinterpreting to the institution the needs and desires of the constituency to which it is responsible."

Benner also made two suggestions which he said would better the work of ACPA members and bring deserved recognition to their programs: (1) "that some such title as 'Public Relations Officer' would tend to convey more accurately the dignity of the function you are performing," and (2) "that it is important to the development and to the recognition of your profession that in season and out of season this body declare the measure of success to be healthy advancement of the social usefulness of the college or university through better understanding of and by its constitueancy.

"This," concluded Benner, who earlier in his address had termed unfortunate "the overwhelming emphasis now being placed on organized athletics" in college publicity programs, "implies also expressed opposition to spectacular, sensational, and undignified publicity of the sort which inevitably tends to break down such understanding."[83]

College publicists as well as administrators and teachers were becoming sensitive to the criticism lately leveled at publicity for athletics. An example was the famous Bulletin 23 on American College Athletics, issued by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in October, 1929.

"Few universities," that report had said relative to athletic publicity, "are so poverty-stricken in scholarship or in good works as to need a 'press agent'—a paid employee operating on a strictly commercial basis, whose success is measured by the inches of reading matter that he succeeds in placing in newspapers."[84]

Carpenter and his fellow officers felt strongly enough about the need for a thorough discussion of the situation that they decided to devote a half day of the New York convention entirely to "the problem of athletic publicity." After hearing the subject covered by a sports writer, a sports promoter, a feature writer, and the executive director of the Sportsmanship Brotherhood, the delegates participated in an extended discussion. The central problem of the college publicity man in handling athletic publicity, it was emphasized, was "to secure a correlation and balance between news which relates primarily to the major contests and the varsity team candidates and their preparations, and the other items of interest regarding the larger part of the student body." It was also held that, when an institution had one man responsible for athletic publicity and another responsible for general publicity, the athletic publicity man should "be integrated with the general college publicity man all the time."[85]

Two other innovations for the 1930 convention related to programming. One of them introduced a format popular on many later programs. It involved four concurrent round-table discussions which took up an entire afternoon and covered publicity activities for large urban universities, state colleges and universitites, denominational colleges, and women's colleges, respectively. These discussions were the forerunners of the concurrent sessions which form a large part of present-day conference programs.[86]

The news clinic, which had been a feature of national programs since 1925, was also scheduled differently. Before, members had submitted their stories in advance, then attended a session at which editors presented criticisms for all to hear. Individuals now met with John E. Stempel, an early leader in AACNB and in 1930 a member of the New York *Sun* staff, in private to get the benefit of his personal counseling. This format called for the clinic to be a continuing feature throughout the three-day convention.[87]

Still another innovation at the New York convention was a daily news bulletin for delegates. Bearing the name, the *Gotham*

Daily Seabreeze, it claimed to publish "all the publicity that's fit to print." One of the lead stories in the second issue announced that the convention secretary had received a telegram from Mrs. W. C. Grannis of Lincoln Memorial University saying "Student strike situation here prevents my attending convention. Stop. Need Grafton Wilcox speech immediately." Not until several hours later did the secretary realize that Wilcox was scheduled to speak on "What to Do When the Undesirable Story Breaks."[88]

Mostly humorous in content, *The Seabreeze* helped to keep the delegates in good spirits in spite of three days of rainy weather. Later conventions would use the daily bulletin idea but with contents of a more serious nature.

ACPA in 1930 made two efforts to determine the salary picture among its members, the first during the convention itself. In this survey it was learned that salaries among ten directors at public institutions ranged from $3,600 to $6,000 with the average at $4,190, while those for fourteen directors at private institutions ranged from $2,000 to $9,000 with the average at $3,570.

The *News Letter* for April 28, which reported results of the survey made at the convention, also included a questionnaire on salaries and budgets with a plea for all members to return them at once.

Fifty-seven members responded and the information secured was much more comprehensive than that gathered earlier. Of twenty directors at public colleges or universities, sixteen said they were employed full-time and their salaries ranged from $2,100 to $5,750, the average being $4,081. Budgets for the eighteen directors providing figures ranged from $400 to $12,000, exclusive of salaries, with the average at $4,320. Only nine of the twenty said they had full-time assistants and the average salary for these was $2,080.

Thirty-seven directors from private colleges returned their questionnaires but only seventeen of the twenty-three who were employed full-time indicated their salaries. The figures for these seventeen ranged from $1,800 to $6,000 with an average of $3,343. Twenty-seven of the private college directors revealed budgets ranging from $300 to $12,200, the average being $2,828. Only six said they had full-time assistants and the average salary figure for these was $1,883.

Twenty-three of the fifty-seven respondents to the questionnaire said they had outside earnings, the average figuring out at approximately $400 a year. Thirty of the fifty-seven said they held faculty rank, most as instructors but six as professors, five as associate professors, and eight as assistant professors.[89]

Through the efforts of the officers membership in the Association grew to 186 during the 1929-30 fiscal year. The burden of correspondence was sufficiently great that the convention, upon the recommendation of Secretary-Treasurer Cresswell, empowered the president to appoint a membership secretary for the organization.[90]

No "freshman class" in the Association's history provided more leadership than that which joined ACPA in 1929-30. Among the new members were five individuals who would serve in the presidency as well as in other major posts during the decade between 1936 and 1946. They were Eleanor Rust Mosely of Boston University, who would become the organization's first woman president in 1939; Frank S. Wright of the University of Florida; Robert X. Graham of Westminster College; Frank Pellegrin of Creighton University, and Arthur L. Brandon of Bucknell University.

President Carpenter in his address to the convention summed up well the promise of the moment for college publicity men and women:

"College publicity is young; our Association is younger, but he is a husky, eager chap. If we can answer to the four qualifications prescribed by Dr. Morgan in his editorial [The Need for Educational Interpretation]; if we are thoroughly acquainted with the Standards of Practice, a frequent perusal of which will do no harm, and if we have a genuine enthusiasm for our work and for our institution, we are well armored and prepared not only to scratch the surface but to dig down deep, explore the interior, and bare those glorious facts which we find."[91]

Regional Structure Created

Nearly six months had passed since the stock market crash which marked the end of the nation's postwar prosperity. Still, the future had never looked brighter for the college publicists than it did as the New York City conclave came to a close. The change of name and encouraging reports heard at the convention, the promise of an even better meeting at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, in 1931, and the enthusiasm of their new leaders all made members of ACPA confident that 1930-31 would mark a new high in all areas of Association activity.

The new president was Earl Reed Silvers, whose name was already familiar in most households because of the seventeen books and hundreds of magazine articles he had written. Nearly all of them had heroes whose lives were models of fair play and clean living, and every bit as appealing as Gilbert Patton's Frank Merriwell with their feats on diamond, gridiron, and track. If the term is every applicable, Silvers could be called a "born writer." He was only nine when his first work, a book of verse, was published and he had been writing ever since.

Like his predecessor in the presidency, Silvers spent his entire life following graduation (in 1913) with his Alma Mater. He was director of public information at Rutgers when he served as ACPA president. Earlier, he had been alumni secretary, then assistant to the president. Later he would become director of alumni and public relations and finally, for four years before his death in 1948, dean of men.[92]

Dedicated to the enlargement of the membership, the Association's Executive Committee—Vice President Kenneth O. Hezzelwood of Hamline University, Secretary-Treasurer Don M. Cresswell of Pennsylvania State College, Convention Secretary Robert W. Madry of the University of North Carolina, and Silvers—decided upon a new procedure shortly after the new fiscal year started.

The delegates in New York City had voted to add another officer, a membership secretary, to help relieve the secretary-treasurer of the heavy work load he had been carrying. The Executive Committee, however, decided that this was a task too large for one person and consequently decided to name twelve regional vice presidents whose sole job would be to enlarge the membership in their areas. The twelve chosen were Harold Ellis, University of California; John P. DeCamp, University of Cincinnati; Clyde R. Miller, Teachers College, Columbia University; Louis C. Boochever, Cornell University; Frank S. Wright, University of Florida; Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois; Frank R. Elliott, Indiana University; Henry L. Herbert, University of Pennsylvania; Martha Coman, Smith College; Curtis Vinson, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College; Edith C. Johnson, Wellesley College, and Nathaniel Sherman, Yale University.[93]

The work of this group was productive. Membership grew nearly nineteen percent to 220 by the time the next convention was held at the University of North Carolina in April, 1931.[94]

The intense effort to impress others with the advantages of belonging to ACPA apparently inspired a good many of the members to step up their own interest in the Association and its activities. This was reflected in part by the number of items of practical value contributed to the Association's monthly publication which had in preceding years been handicapped by a dearth of such copy. Likewise, there was a substantial increase in the volume of correspondence among members from various sections of the country who were interested in exchanging ideas or in enlisting aid in the solution of problems in publicity and public relations.[95]

Having converted the *News Letter* into a monthly publication crammed with ideas, hints, and hunches during 1929-30, Cresswell early in the new fiscal year called for ideas for a new name. Starting with the October, 1930, issue and continuing for the six years during which the publication appeared in mimeographed form, it not only bore the name *Ink Slings* but sported colored stock of varying hues for its first page each month. As much as anything this publication, its content increased and broadened by the indefatigable Cresswell, served to hold interest and memberships in ACPA high during the rough days of the Depression Era ahead. The new name was Cresswell's own contribution while the colored stock for Page 1 was adopted at the suggestion of former President Elliott.

Appearing early in October, the report of the 1930 convention edited by Cresswell was notable for its size, 108 pages; for the fact that it carried the first published photograph of a college publicity convention—forty-six delegates shown outside the New York University convention hall—and because it was bound in a "leathery-like" cover Cresswell explained with a note in *Ink Slings:* "It was just another boner by that procrastinatin' printer. The stock was intended for another job and got on ours in error—but at no extra charge!"[96]

Another indication of ACPA's growing prestige was revealed by *Ink Slings.* It reported in the November, 1930, issue that the 1931 *Educational Directory,* a publication issued by the U.S. Commission on Education and listing all recognized educational associations, would carry mention of ACPA for the first time.

Cresswell and Madry started early to promote interest in the 1931 convention. They pointed out that the April 23-25 dates selected would "find the South at its best" with the Congress in session and the Japanese cherry trees in bloom for those who wished to come via Washington and the apple blossoms of the Shenandoah Valley at their loveliest for those who decided on that route.[97] They also played up the fact that the convention registration fee would be only $3, including a "so'th'n barbeque and Brunswick stew supper," and that the hotel rates for best rooms would be $3 for a single, $5 for a double. For the first time in Association history, members were urged to bring their spouses and the suggestion resulted in eleven being among the nineteen guests registered at the convention.[98]

Opening the convention with his presidential address, Silvers sketched advances of the year then concluded with a warning against complacency. "I believe," he said, "that our profession is one of dignity and influence, that while our Association has made material advancement since its inception in 1917, we still have a long way to go, and that we have not yet begun to realize our possibilities as an organization of college men and women."[99]

ACPA's annual receipts and expenditures were each still under $1,000, Cresswell reported. Receipts for the year were $845, expenditures $777 including printing for the record-size report covering the 1930 convention.

Adoption of a totally new constitution, the work of a committee headed by John DeCamp, was the most important business transacted at the convention.[100] The first important change called for broadening of the organization's statement of purpose to read: "The purpose of this organization is to bring together college news editors or other representatives interested in the news services of American colleges and universities in maintaining the highest standards in this field, and in bettering opportunities for educational publicity."

Two major changes in organizational structure were adopted with the new constitution. Instead of four officers as in the past, the Association would now have eight, including four vice presidents and an editor. Each vice president would have specific duties as chairman of research, chairman of membership, general regional director, and director of athletic publicity activities. Relieving the secretary-treasurer of all editorial duties, the editor was charged with issuing the annual convention report and other Association publications.

The second change in organizational structure called for the division of the United States and adjacent provinces of Canada into six districts. Each would function under the direction of its own officers and of the vice president for regional activities. The Association had been encouraged to set up regional organizations by the success with which publicists on the west coast had functioned for two years. The new constitution called for each district to hold at least one meeting a year.

First officers elected under the new constitution were: president, Louis C. Boochever, Cornell University; vice presidents, Robert W. Madry, University of North Carolina, research; Curtis E. Vinson, Texas A. and M., membership; Frank R. Elliott, Indiana University, regions, and George L. Shiebler, New York University, athletic publicity; secretary-treasurer, Edith C. Johnson, Wellesley; editor, John DeCamp, University of Cincinnati; and convention secretary, Harold Ellis, University of California, where the delegates had voted to hold the 1932 convention.[101] Regional directors were to be named by Vice President Elliott.

The establishment of a vice presidency to give guidance to college sports writers with a view toward emphasizing quality rather than quantity of product proved wise. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching addressed the subject in its Bulletin 26 a few weeks after ACPA's 1931 convention. Although still critical of colleges as it had been in its Bulletin 23 of October, 1929, the foundation had favorable comment for ACPA and its efforts to eliminate overemphasis on sports, football especially. Under a paragraph on "The Colleges and the Sports Page," Bulletin 26 said:

"The avidity of the colleges themselves for publicity has in the past been partly to blame for the unsatisfactory relation between the newspapers and college sports. Comparatively few institutions have attempted to give newspaper writers the opportunity to learn that athletics are only one of the activities of a college or a university. Measuring the publicity agent's success in terms of inches of space his releases obtain is fallacious; numerous institutions have learned to their cost that it is the quality and not the quantity of college publicity that counts. . . . The conference of college publicity officers held in the spring of 1930 at New York University [when half a day was given to discussions meant to improve the quality of sports publicity] marks an important step in the public relations of the college."[102]

Reports on research projects conducted during the year under the general direction of the vice president again provided major features of the convention program. To implement the resolution of the 1930 convention authorizing "a cooperative effort which would have for its purpose the bringing of prestige to our institutions through the scientific achievements of faculty members and students," Boochever had queried sixty institutions. He received replies from thirty-six and learned that 348 major research projects had been undertaken by twenty-seven of the thirty-six respondents.

Boochever said his preliminary study of research in American colleges had convinced him of two things: "that the publicity directors of colleges engaged in scientific research must make a vigorous attempt to acquaint the public with what they are doing" and "that the Association itself should engage in some sort of cooperative enterprise which should have as its purpose the bringing to the public . . . of information concerning the great contributions to the welfare of the country made by the colleges of America through their research projects, past and present."[103]

Frank Elliott, whose research report on "The Attitudes of College Presidents on Publicity" had made headlines during the 1930 convention came forth with another newsmaking project. It was called "The Contribution of Publicity to the Material Development of American Higher Education."

Surveying forty-four representative colleges and universities located throughout the country, Elliott learned that twenty-one percent, or $101,260,095 of the institutions' assets totaling $471,543,572, had been built up with special publicity campaigns. Projecting his figures to cover total assets of all America's institutions of higher learning, Elliott concluded that approximately 637 million dollars of all the permanent funds possessed by American institutions of higher education had been raised with accompanying publicity campaigns.

"And," he added, "we may give our continuous, daily publicity activities due credit for indirectly raising even more immense sums of the three billions plus which have been built up for the use of American higher education."[104]

Although publicity offices were now regarded as essential by most college presidents, as Elliott had learned through his 1930 survey, many of them still lacked adequate equipment. Hezzelwood had discovered this fact through a survey of forty-four representative institutions made with the cooperation of the Remington-Rand Bureau Service.

"The inventory of office furniture indicates," he reported to the convention, "that the publicity offices are somewhat of an after-thought, with a resultant accumulation of desks, chairs, and tables, much of which was probably discarded by other offices . . . I could hardly believe may eyes when I noticed that a few publicity offices do not have typewriters."[105]

The 1931 convention also saw the precursor of the commercial exhibits which became increasingly numerous after World War II. This first exhibit, arranged by the New York *Herald Tribune*, consisted of half a dozen easels displaying clippings to emphasize how this newspaper covered educational news.[106]

By resolutions passed unanimously before adjournment, delegates to the 1931 convention endorsed efforts of the National Committee on Education by Radio "to have the nation's educational institutions adequately represented in the radio activities of the nation" and moved to achieve greater cooperation on research efforts. Members of the Association, it was claimed, had not given whole-hearted support to research problems through questionnaires circulated under the aegis of the vice president. The convention resolution called for questionnaires to be submitted to the Executive Committee for approval, and for members receiving approved questionnaires to give "prompt, careful, and courteous consideration and reply."[107]

3

New Challenges Emerge

ACPA Wars On Depression

The two most difficult years in the history of the Association—except perhaps for the years of its infancy on the eve of America's entry into World War I—were 1931-33.

In the September, 1931, issue of *Ink Slings*, the word "depression" found its way into Association literature for the first time. It would be mentioned on many occasions during the next two years and less frequently for nearly a decade thereafter.

One of the reasons ACPA survived the 1931-33 period, despite the fears of a number of members, lay in the strength of its leader, Louis C. Boochever of Cornell University. As the Association's president, he sought in the September issue of *Ink Slings* and in issue after issue thereafter to keep the spirits of members high, with an appreciation of their challenges and responsibilities firmly in mind.

"In this year of grace," he wrote in September, "when the grasshoppers have left their trademarks in some sections, when wheat is being used to pay tuition, when there will be an abundant stock of peach brandy because of the low price of peaches, when cotton is being traded for chewing gum, the economic world is focusing its attention on the academic world as never before.

"Our institutions," he continued, "have a rare opportunity for bringing some measure of hope and comfort to a sorely tried world. . . . There must be no moratorium on good college publicity this year. We must keep our colleges in the public eye as never before."[1]

The story of Boochever's own life thus far had been reminiscent of Horatio Alger's heroes. A studious boy, he had topped his high school class and won a scholarship to Cornell only to be forced by illness to go home after one semester. After recuperating, he earned a year's credit in three months at a state college near his home. Then he returned to Cornell where he won numerous honors in scholarship and athletics before graduation in 1912.

He became a runner for a New York brokerage house, starting at $6 a week. By year's end he was earning $10 a week, but quit to take a training course with Western Union in Atlanta. The course enabled him to become, by 1915, the New York division traffic manager in charge of employee relations in nine states. During the war, Boochever served with the War Loan Organization, and afterward engaged in general merchandising in the South. When the boll weevil came along, Boochever took a job with a New York textile house and rose to the position of general manager and advertising director.[2]

When Cornell University launched a War Memorial Campaign early in 1927 it called Boochever to do the publicity. On July 1 the university named him as its first director of public information. Less than four years later his colleagues in ACPA chose him to be their president after he had previously served only as a regional membership vice president.

An Associated Press story filed from New York on November 16, 1931, reported that Boochever and his fellow officers were dedicating their year's activities to helping the country lick the depression syndrome.

"Directors of the American College Publicity Association in executive session at New

York University today passed a resolution recommending to their more than 200 members . . . that they cooperate wherever possible with local efforts for the relief of unemployment," the AP story announced.

"In keeping with this same idea," the story continued, "Association directors outlined the following aim of the organization for its present leaders' objective: 'As a means to general and economic recovery, the objective of this Association is to interpret the best economic and social thinking of colleges and universities to the public'."[3]

This objective, it was decided, would be the theme for the 1932 national convention and for the conventions the newly-formed districts were expected to hold during the year.

ACPA's pledge to cooperate in every way possible with the effort to relieve unemployment was transmitted to the National Unemployment Relief Committee and also to every member of ACPA. Boochever requested that each "do all in his power to promote unemployment relief, mainly through his publicity channels and through service on local relief committees."

The Executive Committee at the meeting on November 16 also drew a list of six suggestions "from which ACPA members might glean hunches for promoting their institutional publicity and at the same time help boost the country out of the doldrums of 'depression'." Principal suggestions included "institutes of various kinds on the college campus (labor, unemployment, international affairs, taxation, new sources of revenue, disarmament, etc.)"; "faculty opinion in stories on the tariff, gold standard, gold supply, unfreezing frozen credits, shortening the period of labor (six-hour day and five-day week), explanation of reasons for depression and how we may recover, general economic views"; "community forums for local leaders for discussion of local problems with outstanding faculty members"; and "science and research stories that will show what your college is doing for the general advancement of civilization and progress, and where possible tie them in with the part education in general is playing in relief and continued prosperity of the state and nation."

Directors for the six districts created by the new constitution were appointed upon the recommendation of Frank Elliott, the vice president for regions. Appointed as the first persons to hold these offices were Priscilla Gough, Radcliffe College, District I (New England); Henry L. Herbert, University of Pennsylvania, District II (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia); Frank S. Wright, University of Florida, District III (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee); Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois, District IV (Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin); John F. Williams, University of Missouri, District V (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Texas), and Charles D. Byrne, Oregon State College, District VI (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).[4] Three of these directors later resigned, in most cases because of the pressure of added work with decreasing budgets. Thus Alvin O. Busse, New York University; Curtis E. Vinson, Texas A. and M., and John C. Burtner, Oregon State Agricultural College, replaced Herbert, Williams, and Byrne, respectively.

Under the constitution, each district was to hold at least one meeting annually. *Ink Slings* for the 1931-33 period gives ample evidence that these district activities probably did more than anything else to hold the Association together during these peak depression years. All of the districts except VI, which decided to concentrate on its plans to play host for the national convention, held meetings during 1931-32. Detailed reports on the programs provided much of the copy for *Ink Slings*.

The first district convention in Association history was held in Boston by the New England district on December 5, 1931. Miss Gough, the district director, reported in *Ink Slings* that in attendance were more than fifty percent of those invited. The program included three round-table discussions, one for the eight beginners in attendance and the two on publicity through the social columns and athletics; a feature-story clinic, a discussion of "The Double Standard"; and a conducted tour through a newspaper plant.[5]

Discussion of "The Double Standard" revealed that college administrators, in spite of strong statements made at recent ACPA conventions and in the Association's Standards of Practice, were in some cases still trying to suppress stories unfavorable to their institutions.

An account of the discussion in *Ink Slings* said: "It is found that the publicity director of a college is forced to try to conform to two standards, that of the college and that of the newspapers. These are very different, for their ideas of what is printable news do not agree. The college is often trying to suppress and the newspapers to uncover bits of news. The result is a feeling of suspicion and the utter failure of the two to cooperate in order to prevent distortion, inaccuracy, and misrepresentation of facts. Mutual understanding between the college and the newspaper, fair and above board dealing on both sides, and the presentation of all the facts are the solution to the problem."

In spite of growing signs that the worst of the depression period was still ahead, the officers at the New York meeting in November continued plans to hold the 1932 national meeting in Berkeley, California. July 27, 28 and 29 were set as convention dates so that those who wished could go on to Los Angeles where the Olympics were to open on July 30. Monthly thereafter *Ink Slings* kept up "California or Bust" publicity, featuring program plans and hints on economy for a western trip. The periodical dated February 29, 1932, for instance, played up the fact that round-trip rail fares from New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago would be only $119, $95.14, and $90.30, respectively. The trip from Chicago to San Francisco on one railroad's crack passenger train would take just over fifty-six hours, it continued.[6] As late as June 3, 1932, *Ink Slings* reported that "California's decks are cleared for action," then enumerated highlights of the program planned.

Records for ACPA do not reveal when the Association's officers decided to cancel the convention. When the next issue of *Ink Slings* appeared dated November 30, 1932, President Boochever disposed of the 1932 convention in one paragraph of his message to the membership.

"Our Association isn't as dead as it would seem," he wrote. "We need make no apology for not holding the national convention this past summer. By this time it should be apparent that during the past few years America has been experiencing the smallest boom on record. In the opinion of the directors of the ACPA, that justified conserving the resources of our respective colleges as well as our individual exchequers. That disposes of the convention of last year."[7]

Newspapers of the period 1931-33 were hard hit by the depression in two ways that affected ACPA, its members, and their activities. Some newspapers asked to be dropped from the mailing lists of publicity offices inasmuch as the shortage of newsprint was compelling cuts in the size of editions. "Cut it in half" became the demand of many an editor in these days.

Most newspapers also cut their staffs. Many of the reporters and editors out of jobs endeavored to get into the publicity field. ACPA's employment clearing house received an increasing amount of space in *Ink Slings* each month after the editors reported in the issue of October 23, 1931, that "depressed conditions have brought a miniature flood of requests to ACPA officers from persons, many exceptionally well qualified, desiring work in the publicity field."

Editor DeCamp also emphasized the need for terse, brighter publicity stories when he printed the results of a survey made by Ohio's International News Service manager among fifty of the state's editors. "What the 1932 newspaper wants is compact stories that sparkle like diamonds," DeCamp commented before quoting at length from the report.

"Farewell to long-windedness, dry fact, and old-fashioned colorlessness," the INS survey declared. "Thank the 'tight' editions, the hard-up advertiser, or even the increasingly discriminating reader, but the Ohio newspaper of today must sparkle—and sparkle in a few words. . . . The compact story that has all the irrelevancies left out is what is wanted. . . . It is essential, however, that just as much be told in the shorter stories as in the old long-winded ones."[8]

Due in September but delayed until November 30, the first issue of *Ink Slings* for 1932-33 included in its ten pages a message from Boochever who announced that DeCamp was resigning from the editorship. "My secretarial service has been cut down exactly fifty percent, and I have new university duties wished on me that I have never carried before," said DeCamp. Boochever also gave a detailed report of plans for 1932-33 as made by the Executive Committee during a meeting at New York University on October 27.

After emphasizing the importance of district meetings during this period, Boochever wrote that the Association's work "never had greater importance than it does today."

"These," he said, "are days that challenge the best that is in us. If we can meet the test, we shall entrench ourselves as valuable adjuncts to the successful administration of our colleges. When good times come again, the prestige of the ACPA should be at its highest point. We are," he added, "planning a wonderful convention [for 1933]. In the meantime let's keep plugging to make our individual jobs a success."

Since there was no convention in 1932 and consequently there would be no bill for printing convention proceedings, the Executive Committee voted to reduce the dues, for 1932-33 only, from $5 to $3. The committee also voted that former members of the Association whose membership had lapsed for nonpayment of dues be reinstated by payment of 1932-33 dues, and that their fees in arrears be cancelled.

The Executive Committee named Clifford Orr, secretary of the alumni council at Hobart College, to succeed DeCamp as editor of *Ink Slings*. It also decided that the other officers, with the exception of convention secretary, be continued for another year, and selected the University of Illinois as the site for the 1933 convention with Josef F. Wright as convention secretary. The committee considered favorably a request made by the Agricultural College Editors (ACE) and the American Alumni Council (AAC) that ACPA hold its convention at a time and place approximating those of the former associations. April 21-22 or 28-29 were chosen as convention dates and Boochever was instructed to pass this information along to the secretaries of ACE and AAC.[9]

In its issue dated April 12, 1933, *Ink Slings* announced that the convention had been rescheduled, at Joe Wright's suggestion, to be held at Chicago's Bismarck Hotel June 22-24. Three reasons were given for the change: delegates in Chicago would be able to spend their spare moments at the Century of Progress soon to open; the savings on rail fares would be substantial; and good speakers could be obtained at little or no expense to the Association.

The publication also revealed that district conventions, "like other depression activities, had shown a terrible batting slump this year." Only three of the six districts, reported Frank Elliott, vice president for regions, had held meetings during the current year. He added, however, that those held had rivaled the national convention in effectiveness.

"The chief difficulty in the present regional plan is that the districts are too large," Elliott commented. "We should have at least a dozen districts, perhaps more."[10]

"The heat will not bother us," Joe Wright promised in a last-minute communique sent to ACPA members. Delegates for the first time would dine and attend sessions in artificially cooled rooms. The communique also announced that the registration fee would be $3.50 including two $1.25 luncheons. Admission price at the Century of Progress would be fifty cents with ticket-holders entitled to enter at least thirty-eight of the major buildings.[11]

Twenty papers and addresses, all of them on pragmatic subjects, were presented during the three-day convention. The published proceedings therefore provided members with a "complete manual of operations." Reports on the three research projects completed under Robert Madry, vice president for research, occupied nearly one-fifth of the manual. Especially satisfying was the paper Madry himself gave called "What the Colleges Have Been Doing to Aid Economic Recovery." Although some colleges had been compelled to cut their operating expenses from ten to fifty percent, the report—based on replies from just over fifty institutions—revealed that few had failed to make contributions to the national welfare.

Forty-eight had loaned faculty members to government agencies; thirty-three had conducted research projects on taxation, government, unemployment, labor problems, production, marketing, real estate and similar fields; and forty-one had held conferences, institutes, and symposia related to factors involved in the depression. Covering six pages of the convention report, Madry's research also described the more unusual actions of colleges. For example, Hobart College had offered free tuition to graduates of 1931 and 1932 who wished to continue their education at the college, and Texas State College for Women sponsored a project by economics students which showed a family of seven how to live comfortably on $1 a day.[12]

Just how hard ACPA had been hit during the depression years of 1931-33 is revealed by minutes of the convention's business session and by the report of the secretary-treasurer. Although twenty-nine members had been added in 1931-32 during an intensive drive made by Curtis E. Vinson, vice president for membership, the total membership dropped to 195 from 220 the preceding year, and although dues had been reduced to $3, temporarily, the picture worsened in 1932-33. As of June 24, 1933, Secretary-Treasurer Edith C. Johnson reported that the Association had only 139 members in good standing. Fifty-six of the 195 on the roster at the end of the preceding year had failed to pay their dues.

Miss Johnson further reported that expenditures for 1931-33 had totaled $1,265.55, leaving a balance of $312.36 as of June 24.[13]

The fifty-one delegates registered for the 1933 convention turned down a proposal that conventions be held biennially. They authorized the Executive Committee to determine the time and place for the 1934 convention, and empowered it to vote on Frank Elliott's recommendations that the number of districts be increased to eight by cutting V and VI in half.[14]

Frank Pellegrin of Creighton University, attending his first convention, was elected secretary-treasurer of the Association and Frank Elliott, president from 1925 to 1927 and a major officer since 1924, was re-elected vice president for regions. Other officers named were Robert W. Madry, University of North Carolina, president; Grace Walker, University of Southern California, vice president for research; Priscilla Gough, Radcliffe College, vice president for membership; Eric Wilson, University of Iowa, vice president for athletics, and Clifford Orr, Hobart College, editor.[15]

Boochever, in his swan song address, predicted "great years ahead for our calling."

"The time has come," he said, "to crystallize the principles of our work and give our field a background of scientific principles which will place the field of college publicity on a par with other learned professions."[16]

Members Reject Name Change

When members of ACPA elected Robert Wilson Madry as their president for 1933-34 they selected a man especially fitted to be their leader during a period when effects of the depression were still felt by many individuals, institutions, and organizations. The Colonel, as he was affectionately known to his co-workers, was a five-foot-five bundle of energy, who presided with informality, creativeness, and a wit that eased tensions yet inspired others to maximum effort. Like Presidents Brown and Carpenter before him, the thirty-five-year-old North Carolinian was a bachelor who focused much of his energies on ACPA. On his campus and at meetings he was wont to go about with vest pockets crammed with notes few but himself could decypher.

And Madry's vest pockets were only miniatures of his office desk, made famous in story and picture by the Associated Press. Co-workers swore that his maxim was "Don't file it, pile it," and the desk resembled nothing so much as "a wastebasket turned inside out."[17] This was because anything received—letters, telegrams, interoffice memos, scorecards, programs, magazines, newspapers, releases, and pictures—found ready deposit on Madry's desk top, sorted into neat piles which were removed but twice a year. Despite his unique filing system, Madry was a model of efficiency. He was always able to find a needed item with dispatch.

Like several of his predecessors, Madry had established his alma mater's news bureau. A North Carolina graduate in 1918, he had been pressed into service immediately as director of publicity for the Student Army Training Corps. Within the year he also became director of North Carolina's News Bureau, a title he held until his death in 1955. He took time out only twice, to do two-years-worth of graduate work in one at Columbia, and to serve as a reporter for the New York *Herald Tribune* for two years.

In a three-page message to the membership appearing in *Ink Slings* for October, 1933, Madry announced his administration's goals with typical aplomb: "Now that you have made me the leader of the 'New Deal' you put through out in Chicago, I am going to try to show my gratitude by (1) getting as much work as I can out of each one of you, even if such should prove to be a bit uncomfortable to you; (2) setting as our goal a banner year in new members and in attendance at district meetings and at the national convention; and (3) selling the ACPA and the principles it stands for to college executives throughout the country." An ardent football fan, Madry asked each member of ACPA to adopt a good football slogan: "Let every man get a man."

The eleven-page October issue of *Ink Slings* also brought to a close the editorship of Clifford Orr. He announced that, reluctantly, he must resign because of "curtailed budget, less help, and more work." Announcement was also made that ACPA dues, after being reduced from $5 to $3 temporarily, were being returned to the former figure. "Members who didn't pay their dues last year have been given an excellent chance to come back into the fold," Madry wrote in his message. "By paying this year's dues of $5, they are automatically readmitted in good standing." Madry reported that the Executive Committee had adopted Frank Elliott's recommendation that the number of regions be increased to eight by dividing huge Districts V and VI.

In the November issue of *Ink Slings*, Madry sought to improve morale among those members discouraged by the continued impact of the depression.

"In letters from several of our members," he wrote, "I have detected a note of discouragement over reduced budgets, reduced salaries, etc. . . . Many of us are in the same boat. But there's a distinctly bright side to the picture and plenty of room for optimism. . . . I find that college executives and faculty members are more anxious to secure legitimate publicity than they were several years ago. The attacks on education . . . made since the depression got under way have awakened them to the realization that the public must continuously be sold on the value of the product being turned out by the colleges.

"Each new generation must be sold. And right now, with every cost being carefully scrutinized, educational institutions must justify every penny they are spending. It's no wonder the first-rate publicity director, who after all is the chap who interprets to the public . . . the aims and objectives of his institution, is in greater demand than ever."

Described by Madry as "a man of mature judgment and genial personality," Robert H. McNeil, director of publications and publicity at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, was introduced as the new editor of *Ink Slings*. The publication, which had appeared only three times in 1932-33, was issued six additional times before the end of the 1933-34 fiscal year. Each edition lived up to the publication's reputation of providing "at least $500 of worthwhile ideas."[18]

Madry's desire to increase the membership to a record high did not prevent his authorizing a "get tough" policy with those institutions inclined to delay their renewals until late in the year, thus claiming membership listing for two years. Consequently, *Ink Slings* for March, 1934, announced in all capital letters on Page 1: "UNLESS YOUR DUES ARE PAID BY APRIL 5, YOUR NAME WILL BE DROPPED FROM THE MAILING LIST." Thirty-one members were dropped. The action in some cases was taken at the request of the institutions themselves, which claimed that even the $5 for dues could not be afforded that year. On the other hand, the drive for new members was effective and the total in good standing at year's end reached 145.[19]

The March, 1934, *Ink Slings* announced that Frank Pellegrin, serving as director of District VI as well as national secretary-treasurer, had given his district a first when he issued a twenty-five-page summary of addresses, discussions, and business following its meeting in February. McNeil, through the cooperation of district directors, made the reporting of district convention highlights a major part of the *Ink Slings* content.

After considering eleven invitations received from institutions in seven states, the Executive Committee had announced in January that the 1934 convention would be held at Western Reserve University in Cleveland. The time, however, was left open until March when the dates of June 28-30 were announced. The May issue announced that exhibits would be enlarged for the convention with emphasis on student promotion literature as well as news releases, bulletins, folders, and forms.

Publicity directors from twenty-three states and the District of Columbia assembled for the 1934 convention. The program placed greatest emphasis on research projects, science coverage, resolutions, and, a sometimes-heated discussion of a proposal to change the Association's name.

Of major interest to the delegates was "A Look at Budgets," a study made by Frank S. Wright of the University of Florida. Elaborating upon a statement made earlier by President Madry that the "the colleges are feeling the effects of the depression about as much as ever,"[20] Wright found that thirty-five percent of the institutions covered had reduced salaries for the year. The cuts received by twenty-one of the sixty directors reporting had ranged from ten to seventy-five percent and the average had been nearly twenty-four percent.

Salaries for the sixty, Wright found, ranged from $1,200 to $8,100 for the twelve-month year with the average standing at $2,992. Seventeen of the directors had received between $2,000 and $2,500 and another seventeen had received between $2,500 and $3,000. Only one had been paid more than $6,000. In only one instance, Wright reported, had a salary increase been promised for 1934-35.[21]

Operating budgets for publicity offices also varied widely, the survey showed. Lowest was $200 in an institution in the 500 to 1,000 enrollment category, while the highest was $25,000 in an institution of more than 4,000 enrollment. Wright did not reveal the average operating budget, but he did show the general average for each of five groups classified on the basis of enrollment. These averages were: up to 500 enrollment, $3,877; 500 to 1,000, $2,506; 1,000 to 2,000, $2,432; 2,000 to 4,000, $4,694; over 4,000, $5,488. Very few directors anticipated changes, either increase or decrease, in their budgets for 1934-35.

Because of their salary situation, many directors, Wright discovered, were augmenting their incomes by serving as stringers for metropolitan papers. Most of the directors, regardless of amount of salary, were carrying numerous jobs on campus in addition to publicity. The lowest paid director—the one receiving $1,200—was, for instance, traveling 36,000 miles a year for student recruitment, handling all correspondence with prospective students, directing student employment, and editing bulletins. The director receiving $8,100 was not only handling all publicity, including that for the athletic department and alumni fund, but also performing such general public relations tasks as ghost writing, speech making, directing the guide service, and serving as official greeter.

Whether because of low salaries, low budgets, inexperience, or pressure of other duties, many college publicists seemed not to have been giving the media the service they desired. Speaking on "Selling News," P. F. Swank of the Associated Press chided the delegates for failure to give adequate coverage.

"There is," he said, "plenty of news that is going by the boards every day because nobody has perspective to manufacture it in a salesmanship way so it can be sold to the press associations. . . . There is not one story in ten that comes to us in such shape that we can use it. It is either full of holes, doesn't tell the story properly, or the lead doesn't approach the story properly. . . .

"I don't know how to tell you this, but it seems every time there is a story we want in a college or university, that is crime or scandal, we go to the publicity agent to get the facts and we get nothing out of him; we cannot find him or he is not articulate. Your job should be, in a case like that, to come to the press association and the newspapers and say: 'Here is the cold turkey; here are the facts'; We are not going to print all the facts, but we want the facts. There isn't one out of ten of the publicity agents, when you need them, that will give you any help. But they will come around about a campaign to raise a million dollars and they will think you ought to give them four or five columns."[22]

Influenced by a decision of the 1930 convention to place more emphasis on science, members devoted twenty-one of the 150 pages of the convention report for 1934 to science coverage. David Dietz, science editor for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers (twenty-four at that time), had no complaints about the coverage being given original research and feature stories by the college publicists but said that "A third field . . . altogether too much neglected everywhere is that of paralleling the day's news."

"For example," he said, "there is going to be a stratosphere flight. Perhaps the physicist on your faculty can say something about the study of cosmic rays; perhaps you have a meteorologist who can say something about the upper atmosphere. . . .

"I often think that if I owned a newspaper in a town where there was a college, I would have every man on that faculty as one of my correspondents. . . . If you just think of yourself as an assistant city editor with a huge staff of experts who can write for your local papers, you will find that you have *developed a wonderful source of local publicity.*"

Failure of publicists to cover speeches, lectures, and especially papers scheduled for delivery before scientific societies was depriving colleges of much valuable publicity, Dietz asserted. "If you were to send in advance to the science editors of the big organizations some of these papers, noting on them the release date, you might get much better treatment because it is only human nature for a writer to depend upon material which he has," he added.[23]

Frank Elliott, father of the Association's district plan and vice president for regions for the past three years, reported that sixteen regional meetings had been held since the fall of 1931 with average attendance "as large as that of our national conventions a dozen years back." Although the seed for district organization had been planted in the far western states, it was only in those states that the new district organization had failed to produce the results anticipated. In the three years no meetings had been held in the district composed of Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Montana, and adjacent provinces of Canada, and only one had been held in the district which now included California, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, and Hawaii.[24]

A proposal that ACPA sponsor and promote a National College Week each spring, possibly in cooperation with the American Alumni Council, was presented by Clifford Orr of Hobart College, as the convention's final business session opened on June 30. After a lengthy and not too enthusiastic discussion, the idea was endorsed with the assumption that the Association would create a separate and informal organization to handle it.

Turning to national affairs, the delegates commended President Roosevelt for calling upon college specialists, commonly referred to in those days as the Brain Trusters, "to assist in solving the many complex problems confronting the nation." A resolution praising the President was passed by the delegates at this session.

Resolutions also pledged to the nation's press a continuance of efforts "to be of genuine assistance"; urged the administrative heads of colleges and universities to give greater attention to the strengthening of their publicity offices "to the end that a maximum of advantage and benefit may be derived from an agency of unquestioned importance to every college and university"; and recommended "the annual appointment of a publicity committee to serve before, during, and immediately after each subsequent national convention." The committee on resolutions held that ACPA conventions had not received the national attention to which they were entitled, and the Association's work therefore had not been "as productive of the beneficial results that otherwise would have been attained."[25]

The Association nominating committee was headed by Ralph S. Clark, now back in the ACPA fold as director of publicity at Rollins College. He made a thorough canvass of officer possibilities, and at about 3 a.m. on June 30 shook Josef F. Wright of Illinois out of bed to say that he would be presented as the nominee for the presidency. "I did not like the idea—I disliked work then as much as I do now—but their will prevailed," Wright wrote eighteen years later in a sketch about his administration.[26]

After thanking his colleagues for selecting him, Wright threw a bombshell into the group at the final session. He stated that the Association should replace the word "publicity" with the phrase "public relations" in its name.

"The word 'publicity' . . . has a bad psychological effect, almost wherever used," he told the delegates. "The thought is that perhaps we should change the name or the words, whatever is necessary, from 'publicity' to 'public relations' because a lot of us are doing student contact work, trying to interest students, answering student correspondence, and a hundred and one other things, which are publicity, but also are public relations."

Then Frank Wright moved that "this organization substitute the words 'public relations' for the word 'publicity' in its present name" and Ralph Clark seconded the motion. Past President Madry was the first to speak during the lengthy discussion which followed.

"This is a thing we ought to consider quite carefully," Madry declared. "I do know that in a lot of newspaper offices that expression [public relations] has an equally bad taste. When you say you are a 'public relations man' it sounds as if you are setting yourself up above the boys, as they call the newspaper reporters—that you are a little bit of a poseur. . . . They like to feel that you are on their level, that you are not trying to patronize them."

The name, "American College Public Relations Association," sounded awkward, some delegates argued. "Association of College Public Relations Offices" was suggested as another possibility, but met with no favor.[27] Frank Wright's motion was finally withdrawn and a new one substituted to authorize President Josef Wright to appoint a committee to consider the change of name. The president appointed Clifford Orr, Frank Wright, and Harold K. Schellenger of Ohio State.[28]

In May, 1935, the committee sought reactions of the total membership through a questionnaire. At the 1935 convention Orr reported that eighty of ninety-three replies were against change of any sort. Five members were open-minded about the matter, and two were dubious about the advisability of change. Only six favored the proposed change.[29]

Thus ended the first move to adopt a name which would emphasize the broad public relations activities for which many members were being held increasingly responsible. Josef Wright, who continued active in the Association until his retirement in 1956, was always proud of the fact that he had been the first to suggest the name the Association assumed in 1946. "Even though the

Association did not accept the idea until years later, I have always been happy that I made the suggestion [back in 1934]," he wrote in the sketch covering his administration.[30]

The 1934 convention was adjourned after the delegates had selected Omaha as the site of the 1935 convention. When the convention report for 1934 was distributed by Editor McNeil four months later, it included 150 pages, forty-two more than the number contained in any previous report. For the first time discussions which had followed addresses and panels were included, and they comprised twenty-five pages of the book.

Expanding The Membership

"The organization is yours; the job is going to be yours. . . . In other words, you are going to run the Association and I am going to be the figurehead."[31]

Joe Wright accepted the presidency at Cleveland with these words. He warned his fellow officers and the membership at large that he was expecting a strong team effort to achieve his two main goals: the professional advancement of the college publicity director, and growth in the national influence of the Association.

Wright spoke in hyperbole. He was well qualified to lead and had no intention of letting his colleagues do all the work. A 1916 graduate of the University of Illinois, he was a pioneer in the interpretation of higher education, having headed his alma mater's publicity office since organizing it in 1919. He had at once joined the American Association of College News Bureaus and this history has already recorded some—but by no means all—of the contributions he had made through the years. He had also been a leader in the radio field and in 1932-33 was president of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters.[32]

Amiable and fun loving, Wright was the Association's biggest practical joker and most noted raconteur. He studiously shunned publicity for himself but maintained high morale by seeing that those with whom he worked were given due recognition.

"No president ever had a more able cabinet to carry out the work of the Association," Wright declared in reviewing the accomplishments of 1934-35.[33] The history of the year as written in the literature of the Association indicates that the praise was well deserved.

Beginning a stint as Association editor which he had no idea would run for four years, Robert X. Graham of Westminster (Pennsylvania) College kept the mimeographed monthly filled with ideas useful to members. Page after page of the publication provided suggestions, most of them in three-to-six-line items. Since the questionnaire on change of name Wright had proposed in Cleveland was not circulated until just before the 1935 convention, issues in the spring months included statements, pro and con, concerning the proposal.

"If we find that a change is expedient, and that our present title is hopelessly inadequate," Edward P. VonderHaar of Xavier University, Cincinnati, wrote in the March issue, "then we must find a name so general and so fool-proof and so all-inclusive and so dignified that nothing short of dissolution (heaven forbid) would cause us to abandon it. If, on the other hand, we find that no name is adequate and that our present title is the best that can be found under the circumstances, then we should record these findings somewhere and quell forever the recurring doubts in the matter. . . . It is generally, and I believe correctly, agreed that American College Publicity Association does not describe our membership accurately . . . and let us assume that a change is both necessary and desirable. . . . A title that preserves our familiar ACPA and which I hereby submit for consideration is American College Promotion Association. The dictionaries seem to agree that *promotion* means and connotes the act of encouraging, advancing, exalting in rank or honor, furthering the interests of, etc.

"While other suggestions come forward let me hasten to say that I don't see the need for change. The *major* interest of most of the members of the Association is undoubtedly publicity. . . . Devoting time to other interests with which a considerable portion of the membership is concerned does not, it seems to me, do violence to the spirit of our organization."[34]

"Silly is my word for all this talk about changing the name of the Association," Ted Carpenter wrote in the April issue. "Public relations does sound a lot more high hat and probably would be a sop to our vanity, but I can see no advantage we would gain in the eyes of the man who reads our stuff with a critical eye," chimed in Walter F. Dantzcher of Pennsylvania State College.[35] Editor Graham also cast his vote with the anti-change group when he editorialized, "Let's not try to incorporate all the activities which people of ability sometimes have into one Association name."[36] When Clifford Orr informed the convention delegates in Omaha that only six of ninety-three respondents to his committee's questionnaire had favored a change of name, the matter was dropped.

The April issue of *Ink Slings* announced that convention reports of the American College Publicity Association from 1930 to date were being listed in *Educational Index*, the comprehensive listing for publications of recognized educational merit.

The newsletter also announced that, as a result of the efforts President Wright had made in accordance with authority voted to him by the delegates to the 1934 convention, members of ACPA would have opportunity to cooperate with the National Education Association, the American Legion, and the U. S. Office of Education in sponsoring American Education Week November 11-17. President Wright outlined a nine-point program for ACPA cooperation. He hoped the highlight would be a radio talk by President Roosevelt in response to an invitation issued by ACPA.[37]

Addressing the fifty-three delegates registered as the 1935 convention opened in Omaha on June 27, President Wright emphasized the need for college publicity directors to expand their horizons.

"If my contention that publicity is *anything* that places our institutions before the public is correct," he declared, "then we must not be content merely with sending out our news stories. We want to take advantage of every opportunity—radio, news reels, paid advertising (if that is the only way to get our messages across), various forms of direct-by-mail, feature syndicates, fairs and other means of exhibition, lecture platforms, and what not. . . .

"The old adage that if you have a better product the world will beat a path to your door may have been true at one time, but it is not true today unless we take advantage of the modern vehicle of publicity to let the world know that our product exists. If education is important, then the work of publicity persons is as important as that of any other activity in the educational institution. . . .

"Because the public must be kept sold on our educational system and what it is doing, because it must be sold and kept sold on the institutions of higher learning and what they are doing, it is our duty to bend every effort to so present our wares that the public will be convinced that education, as now conceived, is worth the cost and deserves unstinted support."

President Wright reported with evident satisfaction the fact that, for the first time, all districts of the Association had held meetings and also that the organization had reached a new high in membership.[38]

Making his report, Harold K. Schellenger of Ohio State, vice president in charge of regional organization, amplified the president's report by saying that 268 men and women engaged in college publicity at 159 colleges had attended the eight district meetings. Eighty-six of the group had been nonmembers and at least nineteen of these had later joined ACPA. Schellenger emphasized that the size of the districts still presented a problem and suggested three options to improve the situation: (1) that meetings be rotated among the states composing a district, along a definite plan, so that in the course of five or six years every publicity director would have opportunity to attend a district conference near his home; (2) that in the larger districts, two meetings be held each year at widely separated points; or (3) that the district meetings be supplemented by state conferences to be held under ACPA auspices in connection with the annual meetings of state college associations.[39]

Eleanor Mosely of Boston University, vice president in charge of membership, reported that 102 new members had been secured during the year. She gave credit to a new campaign procedure of staggering a series of letters so that within a period of consecutive days each prospect received letters from the vice president in charge of membership, the president of the Association, and the secretary-treasurer. District directors later wrote those who had not joined after receipt of the three earlier letters. As a public relations gesture, letters of congratulations and welcome had gone to all new members.[40]

The report of Secretary-Treasurer Frank Pellegrin amplified Miss Mosely's report and revealed that the Association had 246 members in good standing, compared to 145 at the same time the preceding year.[41]

Frank Wright of the University of Florida, vice president in charge of research, was able to report a follow-up on his 1934 survey concerning salaries. Whereas only sixty members had replied to his 1934 questionnaire, ninety-eight provided data for the current year. The result seemed to indicate that the pressures of depression were still being felt, even more strongly than before.

The average salary being received by publicity directors in all classifications according to enrollment had declined since 1934. The over-all average was $2,600, compared to $2,992 the year before. More startling was the fact that only twenty-four of the ninety-eight publicity directors replying were giving full time to publicity activities. Salary-wise, however, those giving full time to publicity work were receiving higher compensation, the survey revealed.[42]

Although the move to change the name of the Association by substituting "public relations" for "publicity" had met with little favor, the suggested phrase popped up several times during the Omaha convention. It came up first when a panel of editors, reporters, correspondents, and news bureau executives met for a session on "Our Poor Public Relations"; secondly when Nelson Carter, manager of an Omaha advertising agency, discussed "Problems of Public Relations"; and finally when a telegram was received from Edward L. Bernays, a New York public relations counsel who had addressed two earlier conventions and followed the Association with close interest.

Despite the title of their panel, the editors, reporters, correspondents, and news bureau executives devoted their time largely to the topics of news writing and dissemination.[43] The messages of Carter and Bernays, however, penetrated to the heart of public relations.

"I would say that at all times you should remember that you are handling the public relations not for a private corporation but for an institution that really belongs to the public," Carter told his audience. "For that reason alone you have everything in the world to work with. The public is interested and will respond quickly to your efforts. You must show the people that your school *does* belong to them—that it is accomplishing things for them. You must show them that your professors are . . . not stuffy pedantics, but friendly, likeable human beings. You must show them that . . . your students are . . . seriously striving to make themselves better fitted for life. I don't suppose that it is necessary for me to add that your job is not only to see that the representatives of your school are able to make a public appearance—but to see that the *right* representatives make that appearance. For one bad impression can completely undo all the work you can accomplish in a year's time.

". . . I am envious of all of you. You have an interesting occupation—promoting good will towards institutions that are really communities in themselves. I would say that the future of your work is limitless—you have a grand opportunity to introduce new and startling ideas in the business of public relations, and I have an idea that is just what you are going to do."[44]

The telegram received from Bernays during the final convention session was well phrased to send the delegates on their homeward journey thinking even more seriously of the heavy responsibilities they faced, individually and collectively.

"In these days of a swiftly changing social and economic world," Bernays said, "every college publicity director should be keenly aware of the obligation he owes to society in insuring that the symbol of the college and university as an important element in our civilization be preserved.

"With demagogues usurping the channels of communications to the public and projecting false symbols that evoke favorable responses from the public, it is important that the colleges and universities . . . and those who direct their public relations, recognize all these implications and leave no effort undone to insure that truth, as represented by the colleges and universitites of the country and upon which any civilization rests, effectively utilizes sound techniques to maintain public approval and the continuity of our civilization."[45]

Although Frank Wright, in a survey made to determine the support for a College Week program, had found neither publicity directors nor college presidents very enthusiastic,[46] proponents were loath to give up the project. Lengthy discussion in the business session was climaxed by passage of a motion that "this Association continue its plans to cooperate with the National Education Association during the coming year, and specifically to participate to the fullest possible extent in American Educational Week, November 11-17." President Wright had reported earlier that the Outdoor Advertising Association had offered to donate the use of between 5,000 and 7,000 billboards throughout the country to carry the message in behalf of colleges and universities. Now ACPA faced the task of securing approximately $5,000 to produce lithographed sheets for the boards. It informed the Outdoor Advertising Association that it would report by August 1 whether financing would be possible.

In order to make attendance at district meetings more convenient for every member, Frank Wright offered a constitutional amendment which would have given the Association forty-nine districts, one for each state and the District of Columbia. Institutions in Canada would be included in the nearest district. The delegates authorized the president to appoint a committee to study the proposed change.

The postal law demanding that the name of a college publication must appear on the cover in type as large as or larger than any other type continued to offend the aesthetic sense of the publicity directors. They passed a resolution asking the Executive Committee to try to work with the Postmaster General to change the law.

Eleanor Mosely, on the basis of her year's experience as vice president for membership, supported a recommendation made by Joe Wright. In his presidential address, he had suggested that the Association's fiscal year be changed from July 1-June 30 to September 1-August 31, inclusive. Miss Mosely also recommended "that the annual membership dues cover these latter dates, and that to facilitate matters in the treasurer's office and insure regular mailing of the monthly newsletter to all active members in good standing, dues become payable for the current year by September 1, and the final due date be March 31 of the fiscal year." This change, she recommended, should take effect at once and be considered as a trial procedure during 1935-36, then come to a vote at the 1936 conference. President Wright ruled that the recommendation would be followed, and reviewed the following year.

The delegates, also upon a motion made by Miss Mosely, authorized the president to name a committee "to consider and crystallize in words and writing the aims, ideals, and principles of this Association more fully than they are contained in the constitution."

Institutions in eight cities vied to become the host for ACPA's 1936 convention but the invitation of President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University, extended through Miss Mosely, was accepted. As its leader for 1935-36, ACPA selected Frank E. Pellegrin of Creighton University, who had served two years as secretary-treasurer after being elected while attending his first ACPA convention. The action made Pellegrin, then only twenty-eight, the youngest man ever to serve as president of the Association.

Other officers elected were: vice presidents, Frank S. Wright, University of Florida, regions; Miss Mosely, membership; E. C. Lytton, Drake University, research, and Homer Dunham, Western Michigan State Teachers College, athletics; secretary-treasurer, Edward H. Stromberg, Northwestern University, and editor, Robert X. Graham, Westminster College.[47]

Courting The Alumni Council

Although Frank Pellegrin could count only four years since his graduation (with honors) from Creighton University, he found his youth no handicap during his year as president of ACPA. After all, he had been president of four organizations as a student and had been the first person to serve as class president at Creighton for four years. Described by a colleague as "a very handsome kind of guy, a vivacious, bubbling, extroverted sort of person," the colorful Pellegrin spoke in a vigorous, forceful way, often with physical gestures which gave added emphasis to whatever he was saying.[48]

With a record and personality like this, Pellegrin had been retained by Creighton after his graduation for a combination of duties—assistant to the dean of the School of Journalism, director of the news bureau, and alumni recruiter. Before his election to the presidency of ACPA he had gained considerable recognition in the college publicity field by starting the Creighton University of the Air, a daily broadcast over WOW, one of the nation's most powerful stations; the Creighton University Speakers Bureau; and the Alumni Loyalty Fund, a pioneer in its area of activity.

Seventeen years after his stint in the presidency of ACPA, Pellegrin, by that time an executive and partner in a radio and television corporation with far-flung interests, recalled that his job as top officer in the Association had been "relatively easy."

"The hard pioneering and developmental work of the 1920s and early 1930s had resulted in a remarkably strong organization," he wrote for the historian of that day. "There was a solid bulwark of past presidents and other officers, older, wiser, experienced, and respected veterans upon whom any new president could lean.

"The membership," he continued, "was interested, enthusiastic, loyal to ACPA and to their profession of college publicity. In fact, in retrospect it seems clear that perhaps the strongest motivating and solidifying force of ACPA was the kind of zeal these college publicists had for their calling.

"At that time they were still generally underpaid for the caliber of men and women they were, and for the nature and importance of the work they were doing, This in itself was symptomatic of the spirit I am trying to describe; no person lacking real pride of profession or zeal for the work would be content to remain long on a college publicity post.

"Because the members of ACPA were imbued with this spirit, their trade association always seemed to me to be much more than that. It was primarily a professional body, but it was also a social organization, a fraternity, a sympathetic sounding board for expressing mutual aims, for airing grievances against the weaknesses or evils of the collegiate world, a display case for outstanding professional achievements, an outlet for the aspirations and objectives of its members."[49]

After the 1935 convention at Omaha had disbanded, Pellegrin called his fellow officers together to plan the program for the following year. "I recall," he says, "that we were all quite conscious of the opportunities and obligations handed to us. . . . I even doubt if any U. S. national administration ever moved into power with such grave mien and purpose."

The officers set five major objectives for the year: (1) to establish the finances of ACPA on a more stable basis; (2) to maintain the membership at a high level; (3) to clarify and elevate the aims and policies of the profession; (4) to achieve a more satisfactory arrangement of geographical districts; and (5) to advance the four major fields of ACPA activity: publications, sports, research, and district meetings.[50]

When the 1936 convention was held in Boston, it was possible to report that all five objectives had been met to a commendable degree.

Financially, the organization, which had been operating on the proverbial shoestring, could point to the largest balance in its history—$444.48 after bills of $1,069.63 had been paid.[51] Though small by later standards, this balance was almost double that available to the Association at the end of any past year. Membership was also at an all-time high of 258 as the result of a campaign directed by Eleanor Mosely, vice president for membership for the second year. Her primary aim continued to be the retention of a high percentage of old members, thus to achieve a "tradition" of membership and unity that numbers alone would not disclose. Of the 258 members, representing the District of Columbia, Canada, Hawaii, and very state except Nevada, 208 were renewals.[52]

The membership was further unified through expanded and improved communications. These included a direct-mail effort in which the officers, writing on a variety of subjects, maintained a steady stream of correspondence with members. The president's office alone sent out no fewer than 1,200 letters during the year.[53]

Ink Slings played a large role in the expanded communications effort under the continued editorship of Robert X. Graham. Although Graham set something of a record by making two job changes within two months after starting the year with Westminster College, he still generated so much ACPA steam that he produced thirteen issues of the publication instead of the eight or nine usually published.

The September-October issue, produced while Graham served as director of publicity for Pennsylvania College for Women, was devoted largely to information about and suggestions for participation of individual colleges in the program for American Education Week. The week was to be observed in November under the auspices of the National Education Association. ACPA had not been able to raise the $5,000 needed for supplying the lithographed materials for the bulletin boards offered by the Outdoor Adverising Association and this phase of the program had to be abandoned. The September-October issue also made history when it used a printed advertisement for the first time in an Association publication. The full-page advertisement, half of it an illustration, was a bid for increased business by Burrelle's Press Clipping Bureau of New York City.[54]

The November issue of *Ink Slings*, published shortly after Graham became director of publicity at the University of Pittsburgh, carried an item which indicated that colleges were beginning to move out of the depression which had hampered them during the 1930s. College incomes, the Federal Office of Education was quoted as reporting, were up six percent. Ninety percent of the colleges, it further reported, had met their payrolls in full in 1934-35. In 1933-34 only eighty-two percent had achieved full payment.[55] The November issue also became the first to carry pictures of the Association officers.

Ink Slings made two singular contributions to ACPA's membership during the year. First it published a seven-page undated supplement containing more than seventy-five "quotable quotes" related to education. Graham suggested that these quotations, echoing the words voiced by men like Aristotle down through the centuries, be made available to faculty members, persons registered with college speakers' bureaus, faculty members of neighboring high schools, prominent speakers-about-town, pastors, college field representatives, alumni, and editorial writers. They were being made available, he reported, as a result of research done by Frank Elliott of Indiana.[56]

The second special contribution made by *Ink Slings* came in the first of two June issues. More than three pages were devoted to the first bibliography on publicity, public opinion, and propaganda ever published for ACPA members. Compiled by Graham himself, it included information on eighty-one books and thirty-four magazine articles.

Members found the bibliography so valuable that a rerun of 300 copies was needed to fill the demand. In his July issue Graham reprinted the book list, expanded to ninety-two references.[57]

The May issue of *Ink Slings* had also made history when it appeared in a twelve-page format, printed in two colors on buff stock. Made possible by Willard James, director of publicity at Carnegie Institute of Technology and the students in printing at that institution, it was devoted largely to information about the convention to be held in Boston June 25-27. The printed publication was so appealing to members that delegates at the Boston convention voted that the magazine should henceforth appear in printed form, under a new name to be selected by the Executive Committee.[58]

The second June issue of *Ink Slings*, mailed fourteen days before the convention was to open, revealed that the conference fee would be $10. Half the sum would pay the cost of a seafood luncheon, a Boston baked beans supper, a lobster dinner, a country club dinner, a pops concert, a swim at Nantasket, and dancing on the Ritz Roof Garden.[59] It was the last time delegates would be offered so much for so little.

Regarded as the year's most important single achievement, from the standpoint of permanence, was the adoption at Boston of a revised constitution and bylaws. They had been drafted by a special committee headed by John DeCamp, who had also chaired the revision committee of 1930.

The statement of purpose was enlarged under the new constitution to include a section on basic objectives. In addition, the original first section was rephrased as follows: "The general purpose of this organization is to bring together college news editors and other representatives interested in news bureaus and the public relations activities of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada." The new section read: "The basic objectives shall be the maintenance of high standards in this field, the increase of opportunities for educational publicity, and the advancement of the cause of higher education."

In other major changes the revised constitution eliminated associate memberships, realigned the district organization and increased the number of districts to thirteen, established September 1-August 31 as the fiscal year as recommended by Eleanor Mosely, set April 1 as the date by which dues must be paid, added an article calling for the Association to pay for all necessary business expenses of the organization approved by the president, created nominating and credentials committees and defined their duties, and authorized the Executive Committee to appoint an editorial board of three associate editors to serve under the editor. A contributing editor for each district was also authorized. In addition, the revision committee recommended that the Standards of Practice adopted in 1928 be revised or an entirely new code be written. One major stipulation of the old constitution went unchanged; dues were continued at $5.[60]

Discussions with the American Alumni Council which led to closer cooperation between the Council and ACPA were initiated by Pellegrin shortly after he became president. He first proposed that the national conventions of the two organizations be held so that one immediately followed the other. In a survey conducted by E.C. Lytton, vice president for research, eighty percent of the respondents favored such a plan.

Pellegrin had also discussed the possibility of ACPA-AAC cooperation in the establishment of a joint national office with a full-time secretary in charge. Some results in these matters, he told the convention delegates, might be apparent during the coming year.[61] Although joint meetings were held in some districts starting in 1938, it was not until 1960 that the two organizations first held their national conventions in juxtaposition, and the establishment of national headquarters jointly did not come until ACPA, long since renamed the American

College Public Relations Association, and AAC merged in 1974.

In the sports field, ACPA also took a long step forward. Methods of reporting and recording football statistics had been almost as numerous as the number of colleges. By June, 1936, however, Homer M. Dunham, vice president in charge of athletics, was able to report that a new plan for the standardization of football statistics had been worked out with the aid of Joseph Petritz, Notre Dame's director of sports publicity.[62] The forms the two men had produced were shortly adopted by the American Football Statistics Bureau with minimum revision and still later by the National Collegiate Sports Service.

The Boston convention program concentrated on panel discussions while keeping formal addresses to a minimum. For the first time at a convention all discussions and addresses were fully covered by a stenographer. When the convention proceedings, edited by Graham, appeared in October, the book included 184 pages, the largest number contained in an Association convention report until the organization's name was changed to ACPRA in 1946. The report also carried a distinctive name, *Publicity Problems,* under which all convention reports were published through 1942.

The panels which created greatest interest among the eighty-one delegates at Boston were one featuring five college presidents, all of whom had praise for the value of publicity and the work of the men and women producing it;[63] one called "The Feminine Side" whose content took up twenty pages of the 184-page convention report;[64] and one called "Publicity Potpourri" which ran the gamut from summer school to fund raising.[65] Others discussed "Publicity Aids for Student Admission" and "Commercial Advertising as Applied to Education."

Postal regulations, which had proved troublesome to those ACPA members concerned with publications, received attention at the convention and in eighteen pages of the published proceedings. A special committee had been named to consult with postal authorities in Washington concerning the regulations and rulings most irksome to ACPA. Consequently, Nelson B. Wetzel, superintendent of the Division of Classification of the U.S. Post Office Department, appeared to give one of the convention's formal addresses. The result was clarification of several rulings which the department had enforced and the easing of others over which there had been misunderstanding.

Wetzel claimed that the title of any second-class publication, under postal requirements, must be shown on the outside or front cover of each issue as prominently as any other matter appearing on the page. The words "Catalog" or "Annual Catalog" could not be used to identify bulletins, but permissible were such designations as "Catalog Issue" or "Catalog Number for the Sessions of 1936-37." He explained that other prescribed indicia, such as office of publication, volume, serial number, and notice of second-class entry, need not be on the cover or front page (as some postmasters had been decreeing) but must appear on one of the first five pages. Back numbers need not be mailed within six months of issue but could be mailed as long as the publication retained second-class entry. Coupons, registration blanks, or similar forms could not be mailed loose in publications but could be printed on regular pages provided that, when extended for detachment, they did not occupy more than one-half of the page on which they appeared.[66]

The major address of the convention, given at a banquet hosted by Boston University, was presented by Edward L. Bernays, the New York public relations counsel. "Higher Education—a Public Relations Problem" was the subject of his address, the third he had delivered at conventions of the Association.

"In a democracy in which no public institution can any longer function on a private basis, higher education is indeed a problem of public relations," Bernays emphasized. "Before we can tackle this problem of public relations and higher education we must know what the objectives of higher education are, for it is fundamental in dealing with public relations that we must have clearly defined just what it is we are projecting to the public."[67]

In emphasizing the need for colleges to determine definitely the goals and objectives basic to their programs, Bernays asserted that no institution exists in a vacuum. "Each university exists in a world of human beings and depends upon the good will of the world it lives in," he asserted. "That means that every university has a public relations problem—a problem of orienting itself and its objectives to the world it lives in."[68]

Bernays also emphasized that "the public relations of higher education is not a matter of utilizing the technique of the mimeograph machine or releases" but is a matter of "far deeper significance."

"The public relations counsel to an educational institution occupies, or should occupy," he said, "a position comparable to the counsel on public relations in other fields. He must advise on every contact, every activity of the institution in relation to its publics, just as the public relations counsel in other fields guides the relations of his clients with their publics at every point of contact."

Bernays maintained that every college has four major publics—students and prospective students, individuals and groups on whom it depends for contributions needed to carry on its work, faculty and staff who carry on the educational function of the institution, and the general public—"the average citizen who must be considered at all times in any public relations program in a democracy."

"After you know your objectives, analyze public attitudes about your educational institution," Bernays continued, "The public relations officer of a university must understand this problem thoroughly and formulate a plan for action based on knowledge of public opinion towards higher education and specifically, his kind of higher education.

"The next step is to educate the public regarding the function of his university in higher education. You have the task of breaking down the unfortunate notion of much of the public that educators are boondoggling philosophers attempting to indoctrinate the American people with un-American theories.

". . . The public relations problem of higher education today, as I see it," Bernays concluded, "is [for the institution] to become aware that its relations with the public are a vital factor in its continued existence. Every sound judgment dictates that only by maintaining the confidence and regard of the public can universities continue to make their valuable contribution of academic freedom and free inquiry to the public. In you, higher education has the professionals to carry out this work."[69]

At its business meeting the convention adopted a resolution condemning "any and all recruiting devices which are likely to undermine the confidence of the public in higher educational institutions." The action was taken because the student recruiting practices of some colleges and universities promised to be detrimental to the future welfare of higher education. Also, some commercial organizations were apparently attempting to capitalize on the financial needs of colleges by devising and encouraging the use of "questionable schemes for college promotion."

Another resolution called on the Association to urge each college and university administrator "to weigh carefully, in the light of the specific objectives of his institution, the public relations program now in force in that institution to determine whether he is realizing maximum benefits in educational interpretation and public appreciation for the work of his institution and higher education in general." The same resolution asked that "the attention of each national and regional body interested in higher education be called to the advisability of providing some time in its convention programs for a consideration of public relations activities as viewed by representatives of the college publicity profession."

Frank S. Wright, the University of Florida publicity director who had held vice presidencies—first research, then regions—for the last two years, was elected to serve as ACPA's president in 1936-37. Four of the other six officers for 1935-36 were reappointed to the Executive Committee. Edward H. Stromberg of Northwestern and Robert X. Graham of Pittsburgh were renamed secretary-treasurer and association editor, respectively, while Eleanor Mosely of Boston University was moved from vice president for membership to vice president for regions, and Homer M. Dunham of Western Michigan State Teachers College was switched to the membership vice presidency from the vice presidency for athletics. New on the committee were W. Emerson Reck of Midland College, Fremont, Nebraska, as vice president for research, and Joseph Petritz of Notre Dame as vice president in charge of athletics. Lastly, Louisville was selected as the 1937 convention city.[70]

A number of New England newspapers commented favorably on the Boston convention in their editorial columns while also covering the major speeches and panels in their news pages. Calling ACPA the "eyes of the colleges," the boston *Transcript* on June 24 was one of the papers with praise for "a well-planned, thoughtful and socially enjoyable convention."

"In twenty years college news services have undergone a development of remarkable scope," the *Transcript* commented. "Time was within the memory of many now living when no organized system whatever existed to make the news and the significant achievements of colleges and universities available to the press. . . . Today, the services are organized to a point almost of excessive control. But in the main college news has gained in accuracy, in thoroughness of treatment, and in impartial consideration for the reading interests of all the public."[71]

Happily, retiring President Pellegrin told the convention delegates, "ACPA stands today as the only national organization of importance and prestige in the broad field of public relations. As such it is the standard-bearer of the profession."[72]

4

Forward on All Fronts

ACPA Launches A Magazine

Like several of his predecessors, the 1936-37 president, Frank Wright, was a bachelor. His marriage thirty years later to Lady Eleanor Margaret Bumgardner of Washington, D.C., would be a noted social event. The wedding was held at St. Thomas Apostle Church in the nation's capital on December 29, 1966, with Mrs. Jeane Dixon as the matron of honor and former Governor Fuller Warren of Florida as the best man.[1]

Like Frank Pellegrin before him, Wright was endowed with a magnetic personality and genial disposition.[2] His talent as raconteur and public speaker made him an ideal ambassador of good will for ACPA and the publicity profession as well as for his own institution and higher education.

A journalism major in the University of Florida's 1926 class, Wright became sports editor of the *Florida Times-Union* in Jacksonville before he was twenty-one. Within two years he was back on campus where, as his alma mater's director of publicity, he sought consistently to apply his personal slogan: "It must be 100 percent accurate and 100 percent honest, or as nearly 100 percent honest and accurate as humanly possible."

The Association's mimeographed publication, *Ink Slings*, which had served it so well gave way in September to the printed magazine authorized at the Boston convention. Graham had sought suggestions for a name from all members, and from the dozen submitted he chose, with Executive Committee approval, *College Publicity Digest*.[3] It was printed on slick paper, and its sixteen to twenty-four pages in 6×8⅞ format gave increased respectability to the Association and was a source of additional pride to members.

As indicated by a series of questions asked in his editorial for the first issue, makeup and content presented a dilemma for Graham as he launched the publication. "Shall we attempt to produce a magazine of national appeal to publicists?" he asked. "Shall we issue a learned publication comparable with the various journals of educational associations? Shall we publish a house organ? These are questions which come to mind as copy is read and plans are made for this first issue."[4]

Graham determined that *College Publicity Digest* should be a house organ for ACPA. "To this end," he wrote, "the material will be selected to interest all stockholders: those who pay dues or who may, because of what the Association offers, want to pay dues. Materials will naturally be somewhat limited in that it is easier to present ideas on the news bureau aspect of publicity than on radio, moving pictures, exhibits, and the many other phases of our work; and yet as much variety as time and energy and funds permit will, it is hoped, mark the publication. That the format cannot be ideal with a limited budget is obvious. As much style as is possible under this financial handicap will be employed to make the monthly house organ attractive. Contributions will be welcomed from all members and nonmembers and from specialists in fields allied to college and university publicity. Suggestions and criticisms also will be welcomed."[5]

As authorized by the revised constitution, three associate editors had been named to assist Graham: Willard N. James, Carnegie Institute of Technology; Kathleen Healy, Mount Mercy College, and Wilson P. Botsford, Pennsylvania College for Women. By December an editorial board of thirteen contributing editors, one from each ACPA district, had also been appointed.[6]

As Graham had promised, variety of content marked the *Digest* during the year. The front cover carried a photograph, thus setting a precedent followed for the six years the magazine appeared in its original format and under the name, *College Publicity Digest*. The magazine for September, 1936, featured President Wright. Subsequent issues carried photographs of officers and members whose contributions had been especially outstanding. Making good on his promise, Graham published in 1936-37 articles dealing with the college catalog, radio, gifts to higher education, photographs, moving pictures, news bureau organization, publicity ethics, football game forms and program covers, anniversary publicity, book reviews, news notes of the profession, public opinion polling, and a dozen other subjects.

One of the year's most significant articles appeared in the December issue. It was a follow-up on an address President Clifton D. Gray of Bates College had given before the Association of Presidents of Schools and Colleges of the Baptist Convention.

"Publicity is inevitable," Gray said in a series of observations, "for the single reason that a college or a university is a public institution. . . . The second observation is that college publicity to be constructive must be ethical in its aims and methods. Constructive publicity ought to avoid extravagance on the one hand and puerility on the other. . . . The third observation is that there must exist a worthy basis for college publicity. . . . My last observation is that the problem of college publicity is always an individual one depending upon the needs of the particular institution, its relation to other member institutions in its field, its resources in equipment and endowment, the character of its alumni, and the sources from which it draws its prospective students. It is obvious that any constructive program of publicity must be preceded by a careful analysis of the conditions that prevail in the particular institution. The kind of publicity that one college will need will be wholly out of place and ineffective in another. . . .

"Summing up the whole matter," Gray said, "the effectiveness of college publicity depends not so much upon the goods to be seen in the window as upon the stock which is upon the shelves. . . . The character of effective college publicity. . .in the last analysis, must grow out of real accomplishment in the field of education."[7]

Much of the *Digest*, starting with the November issue, was devoted to a series of five articles based upon surveys made via questionnaires circulated by Emerson Reck, vice president for research. One called "Rescuing the College Catalog," based on replies from 151 institutions, revealed that the average institution at this time was publishing annually over sixty-six hundred copies of a 185-page book at a cost of $1,238.[8]

Replies from eighty presidents provided the material for an article called "The President and His Publicity Director," which revealed in the February-March issue some startling attitudes held by top administrators.[9]

"If there is any publicity man living who possessed half of these requisites [the presidents had listed as essential for success in publicity work] he deserves the utmost confidence," Reck commented. "To every publicity director this list should serve as a guide in his plans for improvement and development."

Fifty-seven of the presidents considered newspaper experience necessary for publicity directors. Fifty-one said education should have progressed at least to a baccalaureate degree. The presidents agreed that publicity directors should be thoroughly familiar with the history, traditions, programs, policies, and objectives of their institutions, and a majority believed that good judgment, pleasing personality, and ability to meet people and make friends were the characteristics most desirable in the publicity director. Other qualities listed were intelligence, gumption and common sense, good character, industry, enthusiasm, imagination, reliability, honesty, resourcefulness, keen news sense, cooperative spirit, ability to speak, sympathetic attitude toward college ideals and traditions, and 'perseverance of a bulldog'."

Fifty-five of the presidents said that their directors devoted less than full time to publicity work, but only twenty-two of the fifty-five thought this part-time arrangement was beneficial.

The president of one western institution of 1,200 said his publicity director was also field secretary, alumni secretary, journalism instructor, student paper adviser, college treasurer, debate coach, and placement bureau director. "This setup is beneficial because it provides for greater interest and responsibility," the president commented.

In answering to a survey on "The College Pulicity Director" published in the *Digest*, the publicity director of this same institution reported that he felt completely discouraged because he could not find time to do well any of the tasks assigned him.

In his reply to the questionnaire for "The President and His Publicity Director," R. A. Kent, president of the University of Louisville, laid down five principles for president-publicity director relationships: "(1) Matters of public relations should be centralized under the administration of a director of public relations. (2) The director of public relations should have a close official connection with the president. (3) The director should be given aid sufficient to allow him ample time for planning broad phases of public relations. (4) The director's salary should be ample to attract and hold a man who has desirable traits as well as academic training. (5) He should be the confidential adviser to the president on matters of policy which may result in favorable or unfavorable attitudes on the part of the constituency of the institution."[10]

Eighty-four percent of the 111 publicity directors who answered the questionnaire for the article on "The College Publicity Director" were men. The average respondent was thirty-five years old, married, the father of two, and earning $2,807. Although "publicity director" was the most common title, directors answered to twenty other titles. The average director was holding down two campus jobs in addition to his publicity work. In large institutions, the additional jobs were usually closely related to publicity and in only a few cases included teaching. In smaller institutions the extra jobs usually included a wider range of duties and more teaching.[11]

The most significant research project of the year was titled "More Gifts to Higher Education." It was reported in the May *Digest* with replies from the presidents of ninety-eight private and eighty public institutions.[12] Included in its eight pages were some forty suggestions for securing greater financial support for higher education. The mass of statistics collected led the researcher to three conclusions: "(1) that an estimated four hundred thousand donors had given between fifty and 100 million dollars in outright gifts to higher education in 1936; (2) that giving to institutions of higher education was more liberal than during any of the preceding five years; (3) that a large majority of college presidents believed gifts for higher education would be easier to secure in the immediate future than during the last six years."

Only forty-eight of the ninety-eight private and fifteen of the eighty public institutions reporting had alumni funds at that time. The statistics showed that the size of the average contribution decreased as the size of the institution increased: colleges under 500, $20 plus; 500 to 1,000, $10; 1,000 to 5,000, $10; over 5,000, $9.

Improved business conditions, rising inheritance and income taxes, increased property valuations, growing emphasis on alumni cultivation, greater appreciation of the returns from college education, and increased activity in college public relations circles were given by presidents as the most important factors in increasing gifts to higher education. Although eighty-four percent of the presidents thought gifts would be easier to secure in the immediate future, quite a few voiced the pessimism that was to be heard periodically in later years.

"Increased inheritance taxes spell the doom of a good many privately-endowed colleges," declared the president of one highly-regarded Eastern college. "The stronger ones will survive, but the falling off of gifts plus the emergence of new public-supported institutions presents a gloomy outlook for independent colleges."

Activities of President Wright which enabled ACPA to make a greater impact nationally were recorded in *College Publicity Digest* from time to time. The November issue announced that the Association would sponsor a radio feature for American Education Week on a coast-to-coast broadcast Thursday evening, November 12. College and university music and a talk on the meaning and value of higher education were scheduled.

Wright's sharp criticism of the *March of Time* newsreel for a release which "in snide fashion 'attempted' to portray football in a 'sympathetic' way," was also recorded in the November issue.

"Because your motive, apparently, was to portray intercollegiate football in the light of excessive publicizing, serious injury, distorted recruiting, and subsidizing, I feel compelled to protest that portion of your release which magnifies so unreasonably aspects and attitudes of the sport, "Wright wrote the producers, a division of *Time, Inc.* "Rather than inform the audience of fact and truth, in sufficient measure, your film left incomplete and inaccurate ideas, and betrayed present-day football.

"Why cannot you deal honestly with what our American colleges and universities are doing to fit football into its normal and deserved place in our educational programs? In the name of those whose efforts may be humble, but sincere and lofty," he concluded, "may I say you have broken faith with us."[13]

By naming a committee on Canadian relations with past President Frank Pellegrin as chairman, Wright inaugurated an effort which would make the Association truly international in character.[14] At that time it had only five members from outside the United States—four of them from Canada and one from Hawaii.[15] Correspondence, however, was carried on also with institutions in Cuba, Mexico, and Russia. By the time the Association celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1967 it had twenty institutional members with forty member representatives from six foreign countries—Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Japan, Mexico, and Republic of South Africa.[16]

Wright also implemented the recommendation of the Resolutions Committee of 1936 that efforts be made to gain for ACPA the privilege of presenting a publicity message before national organizations of colleges and universities. His effort brought him the privilege of addressing the National Association of State Universities in November, 1937. Wright's address, emphasizing the importance of conscientious interpretation, the need for close relationship between president and publicity director, and the public relations facets of the publicity job, was carried in full in *College Publicity Digest*.[17]

Still another precedent established by Wright was that of having past presidents of the Association compose the nominating committee charged with selecting that slate of officers considered most likely to provide the leadership which would carry the Association to new levels of achievement and prestige. It was a tradition which continued for twenty-five years. Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois, was the 1937 chairman of the first nominating committee composed entirely of past presidents.

ACPA's national convention in 1937, marking the Association's twentieth anniversary, was the first planned with a central theme, in this case "Effective Educational Interpretation."

Speaking on the convention theme, C. S. Marsh, vice president of the American Council on Education, delivered the keynote address to the eighty-one delegates assembled in Louisville's Brown Hotel June 24 for the opening of the three-day conclave. His address emphasized the need for interpretation of educational costs, of the scholar, of academic freedom, and of the desirability of experimentation in the search for curricula most likely to prepare youth for its future responsibilities. Marsh concluded:

". . . of all those who are masters of the art of interpreting to society the agencies which solely must provide for its own good, I know of no group other than ACPA whose burden demands more of understanding, of tolerance, of skill, of faith. To interpret the need of higher education for increased funds, to reveal the worth of the scholar and the need of society for his freedom of inquiry and utterance, to sustain the faith of America that with wisdom and imagination the college and the university are doing their utmost to train leaders for tomorrow—this is a task indeed worthy of your mettle."[18]

During the convention's remaining two-and-a-half days the delegates put all phases of educational publicity under the microscope to determine how greater effectiveness could be achieved. A program called "Effective Use of the Radio in College Publicity," consisting of a forty-five-minute demonstration of model educational broadcasting, was presented over WHAS, Louisville, with the cooperation of the University of Kentucky.[19]

Previously,President Wright had named a ten-man committee to determine what the New York *Times*wanted in the way of college publicity. The committee went beyond its assignment to show six basic principles designed to provide "a standard for all the great metropolitan newspapers of this country, as to the kind of educational publicity which will further the development of education and the growth of democracy." Drawn on the basis of the survey with the *Times*, the principles were:

"(1) Academic public relations cannot be separated from administration and educational policies. . . .

"(2) No educational institution faithful to its trust in a democracy will permit censorship. . . . Censorship is inexcusable in a democracy because it is the great threat against continuance of democracy. . . .

"(3) Controversial publicity can be desirable; it stimulates discussion, and out of the conflict of ideas new and significant concepts may be created. . . .

"(4) The American college or university worthy of the name welcomes criticism. . . .

"(5) Academic publicity may be dangerous and harmful unless it is based on institutional policy which calls for a well-balanced combination of the dual functions of the institution as a conservor and as a creator. . . .

"(6) Education is news, and good educational publicity should comprise the expression of thought that may contribute to the advance of education and to the improvement of human welfare throughout America and the world. . . ."

The committee added a warning that the public relations worker in education must be professionally trained. "That is," it said, "he must know the objectives and methods of education; and, at the same time, he must retain the perspective of the layman and of the newspaperman. Only if he has such equipment will he be able to interpret meaningfully and accurately what his institution is trying to do in the field of education."[20]

During their business session the delegates amended the constitution to increase the number of regions from thirteen to fifteen, created a new office bearing the title of vice president in charge of women's activities, and advanced the delinquency date for membership from April 1 to January 1. After some discussion the realignment of districts again affected only the western regions whose territory had still been found too large for easy travel to meetings. National dues were continued at $5.[21]

Membership in the Association, according to Secretary-Treasurer Stromberg's report, exceeded 300 for the first time with eighty-two newcomers included among the 302 total. Expenditures had exceeded income by approximately $150 as a result of the $540 cost of publishing seven issues of the new *College Publicity Digest*, but a balance from preceding years left the treasury with almost $300.[22]

The seven past presidents on the Nominating Committee presented a slate headed by John P. DeCamp of the University of Cincinnati. Eleanor R. Mosely of Boston University, who had held other vice presidencies for the past three years, was chosen for the new office of vice president in charge of women's activities. Homer Dunham, Emerson Reck, Edward H. Stromberg, and

Robert X. Graham were reelected as vice president for membership, vice president for research, secretary-treasurer, and Association editor, respectively. R. E. Blackwell of the University of Louisville, recently the convention secretary, was elected vice president for regions and Fred Dixon of North Carolina State College became vice president in charge of athletics.[23]

Adopting twelve resolutions, the delegates voted "to accept the challenge of the convention speakers to present more ably and more thoroughly in the coming year the true picture of higher education in America." They also expressed hope that the participation of university presidents in the annual convention program would be continued and that the Association would seek in other ways as well "to bring new interest on the part of the presidents in the public relations problems of their institutions and new interest on the part of the publicity directors in the problems of their presidents."

In another resolution the delegates charged that certain magazines of national circulation had, by word and picture in the last year, misrepresented higher education "both as to its ideals and in its portrayal of student life." They then authorized the Association's president and Executive Committee "to take such steps as they deem wise in an endeavor to convince publishers of such magazines that such pictures and articles are unfair to higher education in the United States and to request them to desist from further publication of such undesirable material." The June 7 issue of *Life* had especially aroused the ire of college people because of its presentation of frothy extracurricular activities on several leading campuses. President Wright implemented this recommendation by delegating Miss Mosely to consult with the *Life* editors.

The Resolutions Committee, headed by Harold K. Schellenger of Ohio State University, recommended that members advance their own academic rating where possible through part-time graduate work at their respective institutions. It also suggested that each ex-president of the Association become a member of a Past President's Council, standing in readiness at all times to further the best interests of the Association."

Tulane University was selected as the site for the 1938 convention and Horace Renegar, director of publicity there, was named convention secretary. Later in the summer Renegar learned that he would be unable to give the 1938 convention the attention it needed and the Executive Committee decided that the annual meeting would be held in Pittsburgh with Graham as convention secretary.[24]

In recognition of his leadership, the 1937 convention, through Ray Blackwell, presented retiring President Wright with a plaque. Mounted upon it was one of the plates War Admiral had worn when he ran to victory in the Kentuky Derby earlier in the year.

The normally exuberant Floridian could only say, "This evidence of thoughtfulness really makes me want to tell you—well, I don't know how to tell it. My appreciation is exceeded only by the grandeur of California."[25]

Drive for a National Office Begins

John DeCamp learned under unique circumstances that he was to become ACPA's president for 1937-38. An evening excursion on the Ohio River steamboat *Idlewild* was one of the features of the 1937 convention, and while the boat churned through the Ohio's muddy waters under a dazzling sky, former President Frank Elliott took DeCamp aside to reveal that he would be nominated for the presidency on the next day.[26]

The thirty-four-old University of Cincinnati publicist had a record of service in ACPA dating from 1927 when, two years after assuming the publicity post at his alma mater, he had attended the convention in Manhattan, Kansas. He had left that convention as a member of the three-man Committee on Standards of Practice. In the years since he had served as chairman of that committee, chairman of two committees to revise the constitution, editor of *Ink Slings*, vice president for research, and vice president for regions.

Fellow workers at the University of Cincinnati, who described DeCamp as "a warmly human personality with a deep concern for people" and as a stickler for detail, also declared that "he entered the office working in the morning and left it working in the evening."

"In the rush and bustle of a public relations office with daily deadlines to meet, administrators to consult with, professors to cajole or pacify, phones ringing constantly, crises of one kind or another to be met and surmounted, Mr. DeCamp never missed a day for illness." So wrote one of Cincinnati's deans, Robert W. Bishop, in 1967 after DeCamp retired with a record of forty-two years of service in publicity and public relations posts at the university.

Unlike T. T. Frankenberg, DeCamp had no bicycle to ride to his office and on errands, yet on three afternoons a week he made trips downtown to visit the newspaper offices. And Cincinnati legend has it that in the days before buses he made the three-mile trip on foot, then rode the street car back after walking another two miles from office to office.

"And," said Dean Bishop; "he never missed getting out his scheduled copy. At the end of a long day he was still busy at his old Smith-Corona ball-bearing typewriter. . . . He had to be reminded that it was time to go home, but rarely left until late, carrying his briefcase full of work to do after supper."[27] ACPA's record of advancement in 1937-38 strongly suggests that not a little of the work DeCamp did "after supper" was related to the Association.

Under the leadership of the energetic Eleanor Mosely, activities of women and women's colleges received major attention in ACPA for the first time. A survey by Miss Mosely during the summer revealed that there were 135 colleges for women in the country and that only thirty-three of these held membership in ACPA. To assure greatest service to these colleges, she appointed three committees, composed of twenty-one members. Jewell Ross Davis of Central Missouri State Teachers College headed a research committee, and Kathryn Starbuck of Skidmore College chaired a committee to plan women's participation in the 1938 convention. A committee to solicit articles on women's interests for *College Publicity Digest* was headed initially by Lillian Gardner of New Jersey College for Women and later by Mrs. R. H. Leslie of Florida State College for Women.[28]

The work done by these committees resulted in an increase to sixty of memberships held by women's colleges during 1937-38; in three articles by women—"Picture Possibilities for the Women's College," "Publicity Through Press Coventions," and "Radio in the Women's Colleges"—and fifteen items about women's activities in *College Publicity Digest*; and in two programs keyed to women's interests—"Women's Colleges and Types of Publicity Other Than the Press" and "Women's Colleges and the Press"—during the 1938 convention.

Meanwhile, *College Publicity Digest*, with Bob Graham as Association editor for the fourth straight year, was also emphasizing articles meant to raise the sights and stature of college publicists in general.

In an article on "Serious Educational Publicity," W. Storrs Lee of Middlebury College laid much of the blame for overemphasis on sports and other extracurricular activities on the shoulders of publicity directors themselves.

"We would all have been fired long ago," he said, "if we were advertising managers of a department store and used the same business methods. Nine tenths of our advertising copy would relate to a few counters of accessories, cosmetics, and the toy department while the other nineteen floors of furniture, textiles, and hardware would be left for the public to use their imagination. . . .

"If any group of 'educators' is in a position to help change it [overemphasis on the extracurricular]," Lee concluded, "we are by refusing to recognize the importance of a host of activities which we know perfectly well are not important, and by recognizing in their place the importance of faculty personalities, faculty and student thinking, adventures in research and even in doing personal write-ups for home papers emphasizing the major work, the scholastic attainments, and details of the curricular work of the student and how it bears on his future vocation."[29]

"I have a feeling that we have never had an organization with greater strategic importance to the colleges than the American College Publicity Association," Raymond G. Bressler, president of Rhode Island State College, said in the opening sentence of an article on "Whither College Publicity?"

"You are the men and women directly charged with the responsibility of interpreting the college," he continued. "There may be variations of objectives and the clientele which is to be reached may be wholly different, but in a fundamental aspect your jobs are all the same—that of interpretation."

Bressler listed eight qualifications he would like to have in his "ideal publicist."

"First," he said, "I should like him to be an antenna, if not *the* antenna for the president—always watching for those inevitable occurrences which arise affecting, for weal or woe, the welfare of the college. . . .

"Second, I should like him to know intimately the faculty personnel so that he could assist in explaining and interpreting the work and personality of one individual or department to another. . . .

"Third, I should like him to have detailed knowledge of the functioning of an alumni association and be prepared to work closely with the alumni officers. . . .

"Fourth, I should like him to have a sympathetic attitude toward youth and have an appreciation of the mind-processes of the undergradute. . . .

"Fifth, I should like him to have sufficient confidence in himself so that he would have no mental hazards in criticizing the president and making constructive suggestions for the development of the institution. . . .

"Sixth, I should like him to be a man who can see problems and anticipate action. . . .

"Seventh, I should like him to be versatile rather than profound—to know something about a lot of things rather than a whole lot about a few things. . . .

"Eighth, I should like to have him a clear writer, a good speaker, and an effective conciliator, so that he can substitute for the president either in person or by proxy."

Bressler prophesied that the publicity director of the future would have greater responsibility in the administration of the college. "It would seem reasonable," he said, "that the individual who is charged with the interpretation of the college should have some hand in making the policy of the college. . . . The publicity director, with his hand on the pulse of public opinion, should be able to make a real contribution in the administration of a college. . . . As you go on—if you are performing a service for the administration—unquestionably your department will develop into that larger office where increasingly the shaping and carrying out of larger public relations is determined."[30]

In a *College Publicity Digest* article entitled "The College Public Relations Program," former President Frank Elliott declared that two major problems—media and administration—were now "confronting colleges and universities in the important field of public relations."

". . . our field," he asserted, "has grown until it now encompasses the following media: *Newspapers and magazines*, including alumni and campus house organs; *direct advertising media*, including bulletins and catalogs; *poster and exhibit advertising*, including displays at fairs and conventions; *radio*, with live talent and transcription programs; *personal contact*, in the high schools, on the campus, etc.; and *information bureaus and miscellaneous*, including conventions, sightseeing, open houses."

Although most progressive colleges and universities were now trying to use most of these media, they were, in Elliott's opinion, failing miserably in the administration of their programs.

"American colleges and universities," he said, "seem to be utilizing the principal media of publicity today. They have outgrown the news bureau stage. Yet few of them have taken stock of their various publicity activities. They haven't realized yet that bulletins and catalogs, for instance, are public relations projects.

"One department handles one phase of public relations; another department, another phase. Each is independent of the other. Each is doing a definite part of the job but there is overlapping, lack of coordination, failure to integrate. It is time the universities and colleges make an analysis of their publicity services. It is time they provide a public relations administration which will pull together independent activities, coordinate and strengthen them in the interests of higher education."[31]

Still another *Digest* article aimed at raising the sights of ACPA members was "Planning an Adequate Program of Educational Interpretation" by R. E. Blackwell, vice president in charge of districts. "College publicists," said Blackwell, "need a plan to serve as a guide in the everyday duties of their work, to serve as a measuring stick of achievement, and to secure adequate administrative support for the job of educational interpretation.

"The basis of your planning will depend entirely on the objectives of public relations of your institution," Blackwell said. "Certainly the one major objective should be the interpretation to laymen of the ideals, the goals, the achievements, the contributions, and the problems of your institution. . . . Unless you have tangible objectives as a guide for your work, it is almost certain to amount to little more than 'ballyhoo' for your school."

Blackwell suggested seven steps in planning: (1) list, after talking with the president, deans, and other administrative officers, the needs of the institution—specific problems which can be solved at least partly by an effective program of public relations; (2) list all the agents of public relations—trustees, administrators, faculty, students, alumni, pastors, etc.—available to the institution, together with a brief statement as to how each is serving or can serve as a public relations agent; (3) list all the publicity agencies—newspapers, radio stations, house organs, organizations, etc.—available to the institution together with pertinent information about each one; (4) review the present publicity program—what agents or agencies are being used and to what extent, how the public relations budget is divided, how much is being spent on direct mail, radio, newspaper publicity, etc.; (5) summarize the available agents and agencies not being used presently, with an estimate of their value and a statement covering the additional expense required to use these agents and agencies effectively; (6) present to the administration detailed plans for the development of an effective public relations program along with estimated costs and recommendations; (7) ask to discuss these plans with the president after he has had time to study them, then keep referring to them until they become the president's as well as the publicity director's.[32]

Also played up in the *Digest* were articles growing out of surveys conducted by the vice president in charge of research, Emerson Reck. Increasing prestige for the publicity department was indicated by a survey on publicity organization, equipment, and budget. Only twenty-seven of 111 publicity departments surveyed were operating on a part-time basis. The other eighty-four had from one to eight full-time employees. Seventy-six of the 111 directors held that the primary purpose of the college publicity department was the promotion of general public relations. All but fourteen of the group were directly responsible to the presidents of their institutions.[33]

Activities of the Association's fifteen districts also received increased attention in 1937-38. Indeed, most of the articles featured in *College Publicity Digest*, those on research and women's activities excepted, resulted from addresses given at district meetings. Two firsts in district activities were recorded during the year. District VIII, composed of Iowa, Missouri, and the eastern sections of Nebraska and Kansas, met jointly with District VI of the American Alumni Council on January 6-7, 1938, with such success that the joint effort was continued year after year.[34] At the same time District VII, composed of North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, became the first to start a special publication for its members.[35]

Climaxing the year's activities, the national convention was held in Pittsburgh June 23-25 with "Knowing Your Public" as the theme. Attendance records again fell as 123 delegates registered from twenty-six states. According to their own combined estimates the delegates traveled 104,328 miles to get to Pittsburgh and back home again.[36]

The major address at the convention was delivered by Arnaud C. Marts, president of Bucknell University and of the pioneering fund-raising firm of Marts and Lundy. He said that the most distinctive development in the publicity profession in recent years had been along the lines of the convention theme, "Knowing Your Public."

"In this year of 1938," Marts told the delegates, "it is not enough to know what a college has done and what it now needs. Even more important, it is necessary to know what its present friends think of it, and what others who should be its friends think of it, as well. . . . When one begins to wonder and then to discover what the public is thinking of his college, then his news stories begin to take on a new content and a new style."[37]

Most of the convention sessions, those on women's affairs, sports publicity, and the president's address excepted, were tied in with the convention theme. Through panels, papers, or addresses the delegates heard discussions of press association, picture, radio, alumni, newpaper, and campaign publics and also the procedures in determining public opinion.

DeCamp, always concerned with high standards, reemphasized in his address the responsibilities of Association members as administrative officers in "colleges and universities to which the nation looks for light to point the way from the morass of confused thinking in regard to economic, political, and social conditions."

"Today as never before," he declared, "we need to crusade for a clearer definition of the meaning of propaganda, publicity, news. . . . I see our task as calling for a practical demonstration of the basic essentials of high character in our regular relations with the press and other media upon which we depend in our work. We must hold ourselves aloof from the trends all about us which have more to do with sham than with honesty, which place more dependence upon sensationalism than upon *the dignity of truth*, which seek to sway mass opinion and action more by questionable, even false, claims than by forthright facts."[38]

Another Association first recorded at the convention was a viewbook contest for which entries were received from approximately fifty colleges and universities. "The basis for judgment," the contest committee had announced, "will be appropriateness and originality of design, excellence in reproduction and printing, balance of curricular and extracurricular interests, and especially the manner in which the total make-up reflects the character, environment, or general recognized purposes of the institution. The final result should be artistically functional. Choice of type, stock, design, and manner of presenting illustrative material should contribute toward telling the whole story. The success with which all these factors are tallied to help present the text, as well as the college, will be the basis of the contest."[39]

On the basis of these criteria, W. Storrs Lee, the contest chairman, announced that Mills College was the winner. Six special awards were also made: for graphic excellence, Connecticut College for Women, offset; Knox College, gravure, and MacMurray College, photographs; for originality, Wellesley College; for most effective use of money involved, Antioch College; for best presentation of the intangibles of liberal arts education, Knox.[40]

In spite of the business recession which had hit the nation in the latter part of 1937 and led to the reduction of departmental budgets at many colleges, Secretary-Treasurer Stromberg was able to report that membership had reached a new high of 339 (later increased to 344). Receipts had also reached an all-time high of $1,964.75 and expenditures totaled only $1,850.73, although the cost of printing and mailing *College Publicity*

Digest in its second year of publication had risen to $882.10.[41]

Robert X. Graham, the convention secretary and four-time editor of Association publications, was elected to the presidency when the delegates turned their attention to Association business. Eleanor Mosely, who had served as vice president for women's interests, was named vice president for research, and Reck, who had been research vice president for two years, became Association editor. Other officers named, all new, were: vice presidents, A. A. Wilkinson, Duke University, regions; Clifford E. Orr, Hobart College, membership; Walter Paulison, Northwestern University, athletics; and Kathryn Starbuck, Skidmore, women's interests; secretary-treasurer, Russell Alexander, DePauw University. Tulane University was selected as the 1939 convention site with J. H. Randolph Feltus of Tulane as convention secretary.[42]

Carrying out a suggestion of President DeCamp, the delegates revised the Association constitution to authorize the election of one honorary member each year "in recognition of his or her contribution to the interpretation of institutions of higher education." The honorary member was to be a person not identified with the college publicity field, nominated by the Executive Committee and elected by the Association at its national convention.[43]

The Association's Executive Committee in a session following the convention authorized membership in the American Council on Education. It then initiated the discussion which eventually led the Association to pay the expenses of a national officer, preferably the president, to attend district meetings.[44] But most important, the committee discussed for the first time possibilities for a national office, a goal finally achieved twelve years later. Eleanor Mosely first pointed out this need and as vice president in charge of research in 1938-39 she surveyed possibilities for establishing a central Association headquarters.[45]

In the fall of 1937 airplanes towing liquor display advertising signs had appeared over the stadiums of many colleges during football games and megaphones carrying similar advertising had been offered free at games. Criticizing such advertising as detrimental to the interests of liquor manufacturers and dealers as well as to higher education and intercollegiate athletics, delegates unanimously passed a resolution to petition all liquor manufacturers, dealers, and associations not to engage in such advertising at college athletic contests in the future.

In a resolution aimed at further improvement in the quality of college publicity, the delegates recorded themselves, again unanimously, as follows: "Since there was never a time when the country needed sound men and women more, we recommend that this Association seek to promote, particularly, the activities of those teachers and those students who hold it a principal need of education today to re-create in the public consciousness the realization that we need first of all to practice common sense virtues."

In another move to raise standards, the delegates in a third resolution expressed belief that only those publicity directors associated with an institution accredited by one of the nationally recognized associations for colleges, universities, or teachers' colleges should henceforth be eligible for Association membership.[46]

Delegates to the 1938 convention long remembered it for its special ironical twist. All three of Pittsburgh's dailies were shut down tight by a strike. Consequently, there was not one line of local coverage for the convention of men and women whose daily job was to see that college activities of importance received full coverage.[47]

A Time of Goal Setting

"What does the X stand for?" was the question invariably asked of Robert X. Graham after an introduction. And Graham, whose Kappa Delta Rho brothers at Colgate University had nicknamed him Zerk on the assumption that the X stood for Xerxes, whimsically explained to the curious that the X was "for Xavier, not to mark the spot anyone was on."

The president of ACPA for 1938-39, whose unruly hair and rumpled tweed suits made him look much like a 140-pound edition of Heywood Broun, was described with fine accuracy as "a human dynamo."

After serving as editor or associate editor of five Colgate publications, Graham set out in 1925 to fill a contract as instructor in English at Westminster College in New Wilmington, Pennsylvania. Undaunted when he discovered that Westminster was not a swank school for the sons and daughters of Philadelphia's rich as he had supposed, but a small institution isolated in northwestern Pennsylvania, Graham decided to be the college's publicist. By 1935 he had made Westminster nationally know. Meanwhile, he also performed the duties of English instructor, publications editor, faculty adviser for student publications, track and cross-country coach, assistant athletic director, and alumni secretary for the college, along with those of contributing editor or editorial adviser for three magazines for boys, columnist for several dailies, and contributor to trade, professional, and fraternal publications.[48]

Joining ACPA in 1930, Graham became Association editor in 1934 and graduated to the presidency in 1938. Meanwhile he had moved to Pittsburgh, where for a while he taught and directed publicity at both Pennsylvania College for Women and the University of Pittsburgh. When Graham, only fifty, died in 1953, he left an amazing record of service to ACPA, not only as editor, convention secretary, and president, but also as chairman of three major committees and member of nine others, contributor of fifteen articles to Association publications, author of a chapter in the Association-sponsored *College Publicity Manual,* and chairman or speaker at eleven national convention sessions.[49]

Improvement of current services and formation of plans for the future marked the year of Graham's presidency. It was a time of setting goals, some of which were reached within the year and almost all of which were achieved eventually. Now nearly twenty-two years old, the Association thought it time to evaluate and analyze. First evidence of change and improvement came with publication of the *College Publicity Digest* for September, 1938. It was completely redesigned to appear more professional and attractive not only to members, but to libraries and others interested in publicity. A subscription rate of $2 a year for nonmembers was introduced and single copies were made available for twenty-five cents.

The contents page, still on the inside of the front cover, also announced that "Material appearing in the magazine may be reprinted provided credit is given the *Digest.*"[50]

The postion of associate editor created in 1936 and dropped in 1937-38 was now re-established with the consent of the Executive Committee. Also, the position of business manager was established, for it had been decided that a concerted effort should be made to get advertising both to provide needed income and to make the publication look more professional.

John M. Cuff of the University of Scranton became the first business manager and advertising rates were announced at $20 a page, $10 a half page, and $5 a quarter page, with forms closing on the twentieth of the month preceding date of publication.

The largest issue published to date, the September *Digest* included twenty-four pages, four of them advertisements. Issues later in the year included as many as five-and-a-half pages of advertising and the May-June issue in 1939 offered readers thirty-two pages. For the fiscal year the editor was able to report that the magazine had had eleven accounts, netting $420, to apply toward the $901 the enlarged *Digest* had cost.[51]

With the appointment of Stewart Harral of the University of Oklahoma as associate editor, the *Digest* secured a regular contributor whose writings added variety and a touch of humor to the magazine. One of Harral's regular contributions was a page entitled "Headlines and Footnotes," composed of pithy paragraphs which alternated between witticisms and ideas for improved publicity. Excerpts from Harral's columns indicate the menu of wit and ideas he provided:

"Go to the library sometime and dust off a few copies of early yearbooks, catalogs, and newspapers. You will not only find facts for some crack feature stories, but also add to your knowledge of the early days of your institution."[52]

"Scientists say plants make love like human beings, but somehow we can't imagine a cactus talking baby talk."[53]

"Short fillers, particularly those with historical or statewide angles, will always hit the bull's-eye of reader interest. It will pay to give them more attention."[54]

"It's just like making love to an old maid—you can't overdo it—this practice of making personal contacts with as many editors as possible. And when you enter the editor's private sanctum make it an old-fashioned visit—not a business call."[55]

"Myth: And then there was the new Scotch editor who ran out of space trying to use all the free news releases."[56]

Later in the year Harral became responsible for a monthly feature titled "From Our Reviewing Stand" which provided in each issue a critical survey of two to four books related to publicity. The Harral features were only two of the regular departments established in the *Digest* as efforts were made to departmentalize much of the content under such heads as "Hints and Hunches"; "News Shorts About ACPA's 400" (the figure which Membership Vice President Cliff Orr had set as the 1938-39 goal—and reached by April); "Speaking Geographically," a bird's-eye view of district activities; and "Editorial Potpourri," a column of timely comment.

Thanks to the friendship of H. A. McNitt, president of the Cleveland engraving firm bearing his name, the *Digest* was also improved through the use of more art than in past years. In addition to attractive layouts, thumbnail cuts of authors appeared with many articles, along with brief personality sketches.

President Graham maintained an interest in ethical practice which was to make him chairman of two national committees, one on credo and the second on code of ethics, following his presidency. He expressed his hope for more dignified and sincere college publicity in a November article entitled "Ethics for the Publicity Department." After emphasizing the need for good taste, accuracy, and truthfulness, the ACPA leader said:

"Our function, as I see it, is to serve as an interpreter of what higher education is doing or trying to do. . . . If we are ethical we must present every phase of activity. We must teach editors and others in command of media that they cannot hope to be complete, that they cannot hope to be accurate, that they cannot hope to present the news which the public wants and desires if they overemphasize some phases of collegiate life and ignore others."[57]

Two other articles closely related to ethics appeared in the *Digest*. The first was written by Ralph Clark, former Association president and in 1938 the publicity director for the fund-raising firm of Ward, Wells and Dreshman, and the second by J. Willard Ridings, publicity director at Texas Christian University and later president of the Association.

Writing on "Pro and Con on the Use of Publicity Stunts," Clark said: "Differentiating between 'dignified' and 'undignified' is, and will be, a nice problem. But it is probably a relatively safe postulate to say that the effectiveness of a stunt is commensurate with its dignity. . . . The wise publicity director will put every stunt under the microscope before he uses it. . . . And the acid test is that it must be both effective and dignified to be good."[58]

Ridings, in " 'Stick to News' Is Maxim for Success in Publicity," said: "Much of the difficulty in connection with publicity programs comes from . . . failure to observe the distinction between news and advertising. . . . Even when this matter is clearly understood, there arises a second difficulty. News is divided into two classes—favorable and unfavorable. . . . Let the publicity director take as his first working motto: 'Tell the editor all—and tell him *first'*. . . . All that a publicity director needs to do to attain success (and maintain his dignity) is to give the newspapers NEWS; give it to them whether or not it is what his employer regards as favorable news; give it to them without asking or expecting any special consideration."[59]

Dedicated to the women members of ACPA, the February issue of the *Digest* was devoted largely to articles and shorter items of special interest to women. The cover page bore the likeness of Kathryn Starbuck, vice president for women's activities. Featured articles were "Publicity Problems from the Woman's Point of View," "College News from the Society Page Angle," and "Modern Technique in the Preparation of Viewbooks." Three lesser articles and seven of eight items in the news shorts also concerned women.

"Should the men of ACPA find some of this month's contents lacking in interest," Editor Reck wrote in Editorial Potpourri," let them feast their eyes on the comely faces [eight] pictured on Page 12 and be thankful that ACPA has sixty-nine such members to give it beauty, add to its genius."[60]

Coming by automobile, train, plane, bus, and streetcar, seventy-eight delegates, accompanied by nineteen wives and relatives, attended ACPA's 1939 convention in New Orleans on April 13-15. "The Mechanics of Publicity" was the theme for the convention and the program was the most comprehensive yet held by the Association. Thirty-five addresses and discussions covered such areas as "Publicity Office Materials," "Campus Coverage," "Denominational College Publicity," "Radio Publicity," "Women's College Publicity," "Sports Publicity," and "Publicity Ethics." Four college administrators particitated in "The Presidents Look at Publicity," and thirteen other presidents voiced their opinions through a survey conducted by Stewart Harral.

Summarizing the opinion which seemed to prevail among the presidents, Charles Edwin Friley of Iowa State College said in the Harral report that the best type of publicity is "a balanced-diet publicity."

"This," Friley explained, "recognizes the obligation of an institution to report to its constituency what it is doing in a fair, full, and frank manner. It recognizes the advantage to an institution of building long-time prestige on a policy of continuous, nonsensational reporting of its activities, policies, accomplishments—and failures. It should be aggressive, ingenious, friendly, and, above all, truthful. Its style—in writing, illustrations, and manner—should comport with the dignity and alertness of a progressive institution. If the publicity diet is a balanced one, if all aspects of the college are reported, the public will not get the idea that the school is a football college, a society college, a training ground for reds, and a paradise for morons—unless, of course, that is the kind of college one is running. . . . The truth, I believe, will pay bigger dividends in the long run."[61]

Title was becoming a major item of discussion among ACPA members and the four administrators on the president's panel were asked which one they considered best. All four leaned toward director, secretary, or counselor for public relations.

"It seems to me it [the title] involves what you expect of the man," summarized Rufus C. Harris of Tulane. "Call him whatever he is. If he is in the position of liaison man between the university and the public, then he is a public relations man. If he is not called upon for anything but mere ministerial duties, his title of publicity director is about as good as you can do. Give him a name which will indicate what you expect him to do and what he does."[62]

"Educational Publicity: Enlarger of Life" was the subject of the keynote address for the convention delivered by Arthur L. Brandon, associate director of the American Youth Commission and another ACPA president-to-be.

After looking at current problems of colleges such as stiff competition for students and funds, declining faith in higher education as a guarantee of success, increase in the number but decrease in the percentage of college-age young people entering college and the need for greater attention to adult education—all of which would loom equally large or larger three decades later—Brandon outlined the challenges faced by college publicity directors.

"It is our job," he said, "to induce more high school graduates yearly to continue their education. As population figures of college-age young people *decrease*, our college percentages must *increase*. . . . Our system is not drawing on or developing the mental resources at its command and by this failure it is contributing to the inequality of opportunity offered. . . . We publicity directors must subscribe to the idea, first, that the colleges should be reaching a larger percentage of high school graduates and that higher education, if it is to enlarge the common life, should be put within the reach of those young people who are gifted and able, regardless of their financial status. . . .

"Whatever measures may be worked out, it is the responsibility of the publicity director to have a large view of the educational scene in our country and of the implications for college attendance and support of the varying social forces that are operating today. . . . The publicity director must keep a weather eye out for all possible squalls and head them off by counteracting good forces where possible. . . . We are not only reporters of what has happened. We are, or should be, creators of what *can* happen—ingenious thinkers, if you will, who can visualize the sort of projects that will strike the public fancy and will identify our colleges in the public thought."[63]

Graham, in his president's address, also gave a forward look under the title "Educational Publicity and the Future."

"Whatever the emphasis is in our publicity bureaus today," he said, "it is certain that interpretation of higher education has become a craft and publicity directors are in fact, if not in name, divided into apprentices, journeymen, and master craftsmen."

The 1939 convention was held shortly after the goldfish swallowing craze hit college campuses, and Graham continued: "It is no trick at all to obtain front-page spreads with stories that revolt or terrify the readers or with those which are silly, ridiculous, inane. The success of sensationalism belongs to the materials, not to the publicist. Such stories, therefore, take rank on the lowest levels of educational publicity. The higher levels belong to those who can fix the attention of the public on stories that lack the elements of horror, terror, or imbecility. The highest levels belong to those who have the imagination to make the purely academic achievement news without cheapening it or bringing ridicule from reader or savant."

Graham concluded by saying that in the next decade there might be many changes in media, "but we shall, of course, be ever on the alert to gear our publicity with every new machine, remembering that that publicity is best which uses every possible medium to reach as many people as possible . . . [and] as master craftsmen, we shall strive more and more, regardless of media, to interpret the substantial phases of higher education. If the future holds any challenge for us, it is that we prove we are master craftsmen day in and day out and not sit at a crystal ball prophesying a difficult future which may never arrive."[64]

In reporting that research for 1938-39 had been divided into four units, all aimed at improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and prestige of ACPA and its members, Miss Mosely also took the high road in her forecast.

"Public relations," she said, "is not a specialized activity like the work of the personnel officer, the professor of astronomy, the director of job placement, the professor of homiletics, the dean of the college, the director of guidance, or the dean of women. Rather, it cuts through all the activities of an institution as the theme for each. It is the operating philosophy that the entire staff of an institution must seek to apply to everything it does and says.

"The college and the university are a public trust, and for this reason the public relations program should be conducted with a focus on the social implications and social consequences created through the multitude of impacts which the institution has on the public."[65]

The first research project, initiated by a committee of ten with Miss Mosely as chairman and J. Watson Wilson of Muskingum College as secretary, aimed at drawing up a proposed study for interpreting higher education to the general public. Findings of the committee, it was hoped, would form the first authentic base on which educational publicity directors as a group could plan their future programs. It would also, Wilson hoped, provide the material for his doctoral dissertation.

The study's stated objectives, Miss Mosely told the convention, were: "(1) to formulate and evaluate valid publicity objectives; (2) to develop among college publicity directors a broader concept of the college publicity field; (3) to develop a scientific attitude on the part of publicity directors toward the problem of interpreting higher education; (4) to develop methods of evaluating college publicity; (5) to develop and evaluate new publicity techniques; (6) to train experts in studying publicity problems; (7) to develop cooperation among educational institutions on mutual publicity problems; (8) to develop research literature in the field of college publicity."

The second research project dealt with the possibilities for establishing a central Association headquarters with a full-time secretary as discussed by the Executive Committee at a meeting following the Pittsburgh convention.

Such headquarters, providing improved working facilities and eliminating the need to depend heavily on volunteers who were widely scattered and already loaded down with full-time responsibilities, would have seven objectives, according to Miss Mosely: "(1) to coordinate and correlate the association of college and university publicity offices, and simultaneously to coordinate and correlate the interpretation of higher education to the entire nation; (2) to provide . . . a clearing house of ideas and plans for all phases of college promotion, i.e., campaigns, special events, routine interpretation; (3) to perform research in higher education and to investigate the possibilities for general interpretation of higher education as well as methods and procedure for same; (4) to develop the field of public relations for higher education so that the public will have a clearer and more accurate conception of the aims and practices of the field and hence a more intelligent and friendly attitude; (5) to serve as an interpreter, not only for higher education as a profession, but for the public relations branch of this profession . . . ; (6) to add dignity and prestige to the interpretation of higher education generally and thus to higher education itself; (7) to increase the general efficiency and the public effectiveness of the American College Publicity Association, thus making it a more influential factor and a more constructive agency in the progress of higher education in the United States."

The third unit of research activity for 1938-39, reported by Miss Mosely to be "indicative of current trends but not exhaustive in their methods," dealt with press clipping services, the effect of television on college publicity work, and financial giving to higher education. The report on clipping services was largely historical, the one on television admittedly too early to provide definite results, and the one on financial aid encouraging because it showed a slow but steady upward trend from the low of 1933-34.

The fourth unit of research, which Miss Mosely reported "had not yielded rich returns," was an investigation into current academic research in educational publicity. The total research report, adopted unanimously by the convention delegates, concluded with three recommendations: "(1) that work on the Wilson study for interpreting higher education to the general public be continued in the Research Committee; (2) that the proposal for a central headquarters be studied carefully, discussed, and approved by the Association; (3) that future research be divided into two major divisions annually—investigation and consideration of individual practices employed in the field of public relations for higher education, and investigation and consideration of improvements which may be effected in the field as a whole aiming toward the goal of making it an effective and evaluating force . . . for the molding of public opinion of higher education."[66]

Again indicating the increasing prestige of ACPA and the values placed on the work of its members, Regional Vice President Wilkinson was able to report that "an amazing number of college and university presidents appeared on the district convention programs, as did key men in national positions in radio, syndicates, newspapers, and the other fields of importance to publicity men. Many of the district programs," he said, "compared favorably with those of the national convention. The day of the regional meeting with the inconsequential, bull session type of program appears definitely at an end."[67]

Cliff Orr's goal of 400 members for 1938-39 was exceeded by eighteen, Secretary-Treasurer Alexander reported,—an increase of 21.5 percent over the year before. Receipts and expenditures, $2,798.37 (including a balance of $320.98 from the previous year) and $1,980.57, respectively, stood at a new high, as did the balance of $817.80 on September 1, 1939.[68]

An eight-man committee on the Code of Ethics, headed by President Graham, reported on a preliminary draft emphasizing responsibility, sincerity, dignity, and vision. These qualities, Graham said, would demand publicity directors who were "trained, honest, accurate, imaginative, and dignified." The membership voted continuance of the committee with a charge to complete its work during the coming year.[69]

Headed by John DeCamp, during whose presidency the Association had adopted a constitutional amendment authorizing honorary memberships, a committee recommended that Howard W. Blakeslee, science editor of the Associated Press, become the first recipient. Its recommendation carried the stipulation that the award be presented at the 1940 convention.[70]

Association awards for outstanding college promotional literature were presented at the convention business meeting, with the field enlarged since 1938 when only viewbooks received recognition. Awards were given to Skidmore College for the best all-inclusive literature, to Fisk University for the best folder, and to Carnegie Institute of Technology for the best stuffer.[71]

One of the problems for colleges in 1939 resulted from regulations of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), which permitted radio stations to censor all material broadcast, including regular program service provided by colleges.

In a resolution the delegates at New Orleans protested "the injustice of present regulations on the ground that they contribute to an undemocratic state of affairs wherein both academic freedom and freedom of speech may be affected in a way that is not in accordance with 'public interest, convenience and necessity'. " The resolution also called for the protest to be carried to the FCC "in the hope that either present regulations will be defined so as to give greater freedom to responsible educational institutions or that such institutions will be allowed to assume legal and financial responsibility for any educational radio programs they may officially sponsor and present."

A second resolution related to radio protested the fact that policies of the American Federation of Musicians (AFM) required that "at least a minimum fee be paid to a union musician merely to 'stand by' for each broadcast by amateur student musicians." The resolution authorized ACPA officers to take the protest to the AFM and, if necessary, to the International Union, in the hope that the financial barrier of a union fee could be eliminated for amateur student musicians participating in noncommercial, public service broadcasts.

The delegates also adopted a strong resolution against "circus" publicity, inspired by the fact that "a few misguided youths who happen to be attending college have developed a taste for goldfish, live mice, et cetera, and thus have secured silly publicity for their respective and respectable institutions." The resolution put the Association on record as "opposed to such foolish stunts as being undesirable from any and every point of view and injurious to the cause of higher education."[72]

Past presidents of the Association, serving as the nominating committee, had no difficulty in deciding who should become ACPA's president for 1939-40.

The first woman to head ACPA in its twenty-two years, Eleanor R. Mosely of Boston University was the unanimous choice of the committee and later of the delegates. Vice presidents elected were John M. Cuff, University of Scranton, membership; Harold Ellis, University of California, Berkeley, research; Thomas R. Johnston, Purdue University, regions; Jeannette M. Smith, Loyola University, Chicago, women's activities; and J. Willard Ridings, Texas Christian University, athletics. Russell Alexander, DePauw University, and Emerson Reck, Midland College, were reelected secretary-treasurer and Association editor, respectively. Appointed in accordance with the constitution were Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma, associate editor, and Allen M. Bailey, Oberlin College, business manager. Des Moines was selected as the 1940 convention site and E. C. Lytton of Drake University then became convention secretary.[73]

In a post-convention session ACPA's Executive Committee set the stage for the Association's first far western convention in 1941, voted that the Association's outgoing president henceforth serve as an *ex officio* member of the Executive Committee, and named Miss Mosely and Alexander to study the Association's membership and make recommendations for future classifications.[74]

Miss Mosely had written the resolution condemning "circus" publicity. Because Association funds were low, because she was president-elect, and because she was returning to Boston via New York City where she had done well on a similar mission the year before, she was asked to present personally the Association's resolution to Dan Longwell, at the time top man at *Life*, a magazine regarded as a major offender.

"No one could have been more gentlemanly and courteous and more assuring of better and more thoughtful cooperation in college presentation," she recalled in a later report. "And while *Life* did not suddenly omit all such reporting, the fact remains that, over a period of slow time, its policy was revamped so that more of real college life and work were depicted, even though the lighter side continued, the latter perhaps in less derogatory vein than had been evident previously."[75]

Publication of the convention proceedings for 1939 rounded out the Association's year. The 146-page book, which included indexes both for all convention proceedings published since 1924 and for *College Publicity Digest*, 1936-39, provided the Association with another first. It was the first piece of Association literature copyrighted with "all rights reserved."[76]

A Woman Takes Command

Eleanor Rust Mosely—Mrs. Edward R. Collier after her marriage in 1943—was more than the first woman president of the American College Publicity Association, soon to become the American College Public Relations Association. From the day she joined the Association in 1930 until her retirement as director of Boston University's publicity bureau in 1956, she was associated with almost every significant advancement made by the organization.

Between 1934 and 1939 she held for one or more years every Association vice presidency except that for sports—and later admitted that she would have liked "to take a whack at that as well." "I should have liked," she said, "to show the people in that field where they wore their blinders and why it would have been to their benefit as well as to that of higher education across the board to have taken off the blinders early in the game."

Originator of the movement to establish a central office for the Association, she worked diligently for that objective for a dozen years. Guy E. Snavely, executive director of the Association of American Colleges, early showed enthusiasm for the project but neither ACPA nor AAC had the funds necessary to achieve the goal. Then when Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University, became AAC's president in 1950, Mrs. Collier challenged him with an imaginative approach typical of her normal modus operandi.

"We were so near the verge of winning our point that I tried to persuade him that it would be a happy coincidence if he as AAC president could push through the long-awaited and much-worked-for cooperation for the project which I in my Association had started. This appealed to his sentiment apparently, for such was exactly what happened."[77]

The editor of the *College Publicity Digest*, in an article following Miss Mosely's election, called her "a dreamer extraordinary to whom all things are a challenge of service. But Miss Mosely is no mere dreamer; more important, she is a doer who makes dreams come true."[78]

In his book, *Interesting Happenings in Boston University's History*, E. Ray Speare said this of Mrs. Collier: "She was early recognized not only as a pioneer in forging the links in the developing chain of better public relations for higher education, but as a leader in the area of creative ideas and their implementation."[79]

"Her approach to publicizing Boston University is creative, original, and ingenious," said Max R. Grossman, former head of the university's Division of Journalism and a public affairs officer for the United States Information Agency. Illustrating his point in an article written for a Boston newspaper when the university observed Mrs. Collier's twenty-fifth year as director of publicity, Grossman told how one of her efforts had brought the university "round-the-world attention."

"When . . . she learned that Hollywood was planning to make a film biography of Alexander Graham Bell," Grossman wrote, "she kept reminding film makers that the inventor made the telephone in a B. U. laboratory with funds borrowed from the president of the university."[80]

When ACPRA held its 1955 convention in Chicago eight weeks later it, too, honored Mrs. Collier by conferring upon her its award for outstanding achievement. In part, the citation read:

"As the first woman president of the Association, as a distinguished public relations practitioner, and as a guide and mentor to many who received from her their first insight into educational public relations, she has achieved in the highest degree the ideals and objectives of those who are the true interpreters of higher education in America."[81]

To this President Francis C. Pray added his own words of praise as he conferred the award: "During this quarter century Mrs. Collier has been influential in initiating many far-reaching professional goals which are today being attained in educational public relations."[82]

The 1955 award was the second ACPRA had conferred upon Mrs. Collier. Thirteen years earlier she had won its award for distinguished service and unselfish devotion to the Association over a long period of years. Even then "the indelible record of splendid example she has left in the annals of this Association" was a long one.[83] To further demonstrate the high regard in which Mrs. Collier was held, the New England district—the one at whose 1929 meeting she had her first contact with the Association she was later to lead—established the Eleanor R. Collier Award in 1969, thirteen years after her retirement as director of publicity at Boston University. The award is given annually to that college public relations person "who best exemplifies Eleanor R. Collier's high qualities and standards of professional achievement."[84]

This award was created in recognition not only of the contributions Mrs. Collier had made as director of publicity at Boston University and in a score of ways to ACPRA and its predecessor, ACPA, but also those she had made in expanding understanding of public relations for higher education through her teaching and counseling. One of her former student assistants, who had become a university dean, described her as "a superlative public relations practitioner . . . whose B. U. office attracted and trained a granary of talented young men and women."[85]

It was not surprising, then, that when she retired as director of publicity in 1956 the university retained her on its faculty. She was then to teach a course in feature writing and to introduce the first course in public relations for higher education included in the curriculum of a major institution.

This course, offered for seniors and graduate students, attracted wide attention. Then, as ACPRA was holding its first national conference together with the American Alumni Council in 1960, it had on its program for the first time a session devoted to "Educational Preparation for Education Public Relations," and Mrs. Collier was the speaker. Her efforts to help young men and women secure better preparation to become professinal public relations people continued while she served an additional three years as editorial adviser for Boston University after retiring from the institution's faculty in 1969.

"I believe ACPRA," she declared in expressing convictions repeated frequently, "should throw its weight behind some kind of system to influence desirable and talented young people to enter the field. . . . The time is now upon us when results will certainly be on a higher level of attainment if we can have more adequately, more fully and, shall I say, more properly-prepared people entering the field."[86]

Mrs. Collier's opinions were recognized increasingly by ACPRA during the 1960s and early 1970s when it began holding special sessions for newcomers in connection with the national conference. It also provided membership status for young people interested in entering the public relations field.

While Mrs. Collier counted "among my greatest blessings my association with ACPRA people, and the experience of our mutual struggle to raise the standards of our work across the nation," she suffered one major disappointment. She did not see fulfilled her dream of a strong public relations program for the Association itself.

"We never really came to grips with a national public relations program for ACPRA," she wrote. "The nearest approach I was able to accomplish was to institute the national award idea, this in the hope of attracting some attention to our work . . . but even this was slow in gaining support and momentum."[87]

The Eleanor Mosely who became ACPA's first woman president was a tall (five feet nine inches), handsome individual whose friendly blue eyes beneath soft brown hair suggested that she possessed a keen sense of humor. "She is highly sophisticated in the best possible way, most articulate and direct," one of her closest friends commented.[88]

While those with whom she worked were always impressed with her presence and personality, other attributes also stood out, integrity strongest of all.

"The honesty, the candor, the tenacity, always stood out and, when combined with Eleanor's incredibly long work day, constructive results invariably followed," wrote Emanuel Goldberg, a former student assistant, when he was assistant dean for planning at Brandeis University. "These qualities along with her personality endeared her to editors, reporters, educators, co-workers, students, and all sorts of people."[89]

Born in Westfield, Massachusetts, a descendant of one of the Plymouth Pilgrims, Miss Mosely had been bitten by "the journalism bug" before she was out of the pigtail stage. With her two brothers she founded a monthly publication known as *The Highland Star*. Westfield citizens were canvassed for the three-cent subscription and the journal thrived. The enterprise was abandoned only after labor problems became insurmountable as sister and brothers moved along into high school.[90]

During four years as a teacher after graduating from the state college in her home town, Miss Mosely continued her writing by working free lance for newspapers and magazines and contributing poetry to publications in that field. It seemed only natural, then, that she should become an assistant in publicity at Boston University during the two years she was completing work for a degree. Thus was the stage set for her long service as director of publicity for the university and in a multitude of jobs for ACPA and ACPRA.

"In a history-making world," President Mosely said in her first message to the Association's general membership, "it behooves us, each in his own small way, as never before, to build well from day to day. If education is to be the breakwater of our American beliefs against the outside waves that dash constantly upon them, our duty is to contribute our sincere services to the strengthening of this bulwark. We have a tremendous force in the knowledge, albilities, and vision which we possess."[91]

Later in her administration Miss Mosely emphasized for the general public the objectives toward which the Association had been striving when she said:

"The colleges and universities of the country are public trusts. They exist for the bettering of humanity. One of their duties is to explain themselves to the publics which they serve. As I see it this is the chief reason for the existence on a campus of a publicity officer or public relations director. The American College Pubicity Association, with between 400 and 500 members, is the only national organization of such workers. Through cooperative efforts we strive continuously to raise the standards of work which, like Topsy, 'just growed'. Today we are establishing principles and ethics, not only that individual efforts may be improved but that the entire field of educational interpretation will benefit."[92]

During the months between conventions, *College Publicity Digest* continued to be the main medium for moving the Association toward the achievement of its goals. The goal of making the magazine "truly representative of the whole field of college publicity" came nearer achievement after November, 1939, when two contributing editors were added to the staff. One, Elmer G. Sulzer of the University of Kentucky, at that time considered to be the Association's top authority in the radio field, thereafter was responsible for monthly articles on the use of radio as a communication medium. The other, Francis C. Pray of Massachusetts State College, assumed responsibility for enlarging and improving the "Hints and Hunches" page by calling on a larger group for suggestions and concentrating on a different subject each month.[93]

Articles by professionals in fields allied with publicity and by top administrators of colleges and universities were featured during the year, along with constant emphasis on the need to raise standards and broaden the scope of influence both for individual members and for the Association itself.

Writing in a day when millions of readers had sent Dale Carnegie's *How to Win Friends and Influence People* through forty editions, George Lundy, vice president of the pioneer fund-raising firm of Marts and Lundy, said "Never has there been a greater appreciation of the value of good will than exists today."[94]

In an article entitled "Public Relations Become the College's Right Arm," Lundy saw five purposes for such a department in a given college: "(1) to attract to its classrooms and laboratories men and women of training, experience, personality, and teaching ability; (2) to attract to its halls young men and women who have a desire for higher education and are determined to get it; (3) to inspire the loyalty and support of the alumni; (4) to develop a large circle of friends whose influence will be helpful and whose gifts will supply the funds needed for equipment and endowment; and (5) to build good will among the people generally and to educate them as to the ideals, objectives, and accomplishments of the college."

"The public realtions director," Lundy asserted, "should make his department a clearinghouse for all contacts with various phases of the public. He should assemble and keep up to date, with the help of the alumni secretary, a complete file of the alumni, of present friends and contributors, of parents, of newspaper editors in his area, of high school principals and superintendents, of religious leaders, of prospective students, of new friends and potential givers, of persons who should know about the college, of the addresses of religious publications, journals of higher education, and school publications. His office should be a workshop in which plans can be formulated for distributing information and stirring the enthusiasm of all sections of the public who can help build up the prestige and resources of the college."[95]

The senior partner in Marts and Lundy, Arnaud C. Marts, who also served simultaneously as president of Bucknell

University, emphasized the same five purposes, albeit in different phraseology, in an article called "Effective Publicity for Institutions of Higher Learning." Listing seventeen major publics the college should seek to influence, Marts said that "the public relations director . . . each day should ask himself 'What can I do today or tomorrow to carry forward the prestige of my college on one or more of these seventeen fronts?'"

After the public relations department has been set up and manned, Marts wrote, the director should make a careful study of present public opinion about his college, if possible using techniques similar to those employed by George Gallup's Institute of Public Opinion.

"What do the college's friends and the general public think of it now? What is the present attitude toward it? This opinion," said Marts, "should be studied and measured before the director can make proper plans for helping create the desired public relations results."[96]

In an article called "Uses of Publicity as Seen by a University President," Alexander G. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan, emphasized the values of "honest interpretation."

"This method," he declared, "explains the nature and uses of education, discusses scientifically, and thus sanely, the methods of training human beings, entails the publication of the results of studies of staff members when carefully completed, and keeps before the world the successes of specific institutions as measured against the ideals of an integrated and comprehensive philosophy of education. . . .

"There is no hope for the world in educational panaceas, get-rich-quick schemes, muckraking, or cheap competition between institutions. Salvation lies in honest, sane, progressive, cooperative efforts to improve every phase of training which contributes to the advancement of knowledge and the development of well-rounded citizens of the world."[97]

Deane W. Malott, chancellor of the University of Kansas and shortly afterward chancellor at Cornell Universtiy, emphasized the values of word-of-mouth publicity in an article, "The Challenge Faced by Publicity in Education."

"All publicity," he said, "is in effect an interpretation of the character of our effort—of the quality, personality, and service of our work. . . . It is our job . . . to interpret the character of our organization forcefully enough to create what Mark Twain somewhere called the mouth-to-mouth publicity of 'dinner table conversation'. Nothing is more worthwhile to attain than that our institution becomes the subject of conversation on the train, at social gatherings, at the luncheon club, with a good word spoken here, there, and everywhere in the daily lives of our people. . . .

"It [the public relations program] is a major job which takes time, imagination, tact, and perseverance if we are to succeed. While each must strive for the personal ends of selling his individual institution, we are in reality engaged in a common cause. In a world of rapid change, we live amid great instability. Everything in our modern world is being challenged. Our forms of government and law are undergoing experiment and change throughout the world. Religion in vast areas of the world is under fire. Business and commerce are subjected to terrific criticism. The whole social order is now in a state of flux.

"If the torch of knowledge is to be carried successfully through to calmer times, if education is to do its part in defending our civilization, it too must be experimental, it must be broad of purpose, it must interpret itself constantly to our fellow men, and it must stand firm in purpose through the years. This is the challenge of public relations in every college and university in the country today."[98]

Rowland Haynes, president of the University of Omaha, writing in the same issue of the *Digest,* also stressed the value of word-of-mouth publicity and told how his institution stimulated it through a series of small luncheons for business men.

"We waste a great deal of money, time, and effort in publicity for educational institutions because we do not do a little clear thinking about our objectives and methds," Haynes said in introducing his subject. Before any major publicity effort is made, he suggested, four questions should be asked: "(1) To whom are we talking? (2) What do we want to say to them? (3) What is the best means of saying it? (4) What do we want them to do after we have talked to them?"[99]

The origin of the Homecoming custom, for years a tradition at most colleges and universities, was traced to the University of Illinois by the *Digest*. The year was 1910. The idea of sponsoring a great alumni rally at the time of some football game originated with two students as they sat on a curb in front of the university's YMCA building discussing ways by which former students could be induced to return to the campus. In the course of its research, the *Digest* discovered that the University of Illinois had the first cheerleader back in 1920 and held the first official Mother's Day celebration in 1921.[100]

The February issue of the *Digest* recorded the claim of the Central YMCA College of Chicago that it had been the first collegiate institution to enter the field of television with two programs the preceding November.[101]

Largely through editorials, the *Digest* continued the Association's campaign against "cheap stunt publicity." But college publicists took up the banner. Those at Marquette, Milwaukee-Downer, Mount Mary, and Carroll College revealed that they had recently turned thumbs down on the proposal of a picture weekly that professional models be allowed to pose in "wasp corsets" in front of college buildings.[102]

In his strongest editorial against "undignified, obnoxious, and cheap" publicity, the *Digest* editor urged action against members guilty of originating such publicity. At the same time he pointed out that college administrators were occasionally to blame because "they sometimes place in the extremely important position of publicity director persons who are too young and inexperienced to grasp the full significance of their office."

"ACPA's duty," he concluded, "is therefore two-fold: It must reprimand those of its members whose activities bring criticism on the whole group, and it must create among administrators and educators in general a greater appreciation of publicity, its duties, opportunities, and responsibilities. Of these things the second is by far the more important, because fruition of efforts along this line will in large measure eliminate the situations which are likely to make necessary the first."[103]

Although ACPA's twenty-fifth anniversary was still two years hence, President Mosely in February, 1940, appointed a Silver Anniversary Committee of twelve members "to make sure that the anniversary will be celebrated in a manner drawing proper attention to the significance of ACPA's work." Heading the group, which included six past presidents, was Edmund G. Carpenter of Marquette University, president in 1929-30.[104]

For the second year, the February issue of the *Digest* was dedicated to the Association's women members. Its thirty-two pages included the photographs of twenty-three of those women, articles by five of them, and items about thirteen others.

Classified advertising made its debut in the *Digest* in the April, 1940, issue when the publisher of a New York State weekly announced in nine lines that he was available for a college publicity post.[105]

When ACPA in 1939 voted to hold its 1940 convention in Des Moines, E. C. Lytton of Drake University, convention secretary, promised to provide "the biggest and best program in the Association's history to date." He made good his promise. On April 24-27 he unveiled a program including fifty-nine speakers, exclusive of two panels, one of which featured nine college administrators, the other four professors. Most of the speakers, fifty-three of whom were Association members, were allotted five minutes for their talks and five minutes for general discussion. Even the breakfast hours were devoted to idea-gathering as representatives of junior colleges, denominational colleges, state universities, and Catholic institutions held separate discussion sessions. Some of the sessions, like those on publications, sports, and women's activities, were held concurrently. Seven officers and as many committees also made reports.

The biggest barrage of build-up publicity yet undertaken by the Association led to a record attendance—137 persons, exclusive of wives and nonmember speakers, representing twenty-nine states and the District of Columbia.[106] "Humanizing Education" was the convention theme.

Although Associate Editor Stewart Harral used his blue pencil ruthlessly to condense speeches, discussion material, and reports, the convention proceedings, *Publicity Problems,* for 1940 ran to a record 182 pages. It was held to this length only after the indexes and appendices carried in earlier years had been eliminated.

Drake's Lytton more than delivered on another promise he had made—that he would make sure ACPA was featured on a national radio program in connection with the convention. Although the convention did not open officially until the morning of April 25, most of the delegates were on hand the day before to see and hear a program carried by NBC. Two days later the Mutual Broadcasting Company carried a program featuring other ACPA leaders. Participating in the first national broadcast in addition to Drake's A Cappella Choir and the university's president, Daniel W. Morehouse, were Miss Mosely and Lytton; Clifford Orr, Hobart College; Harold Ellis, University of California, Berkeley; Allen M. Bailey, Oberlin; and J. Willard Ridings, Texas Christian University. Participants in the second broadcast were Miss Mosely, Elmer G. Sulzer, University of Kentucky; Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma; Russell Alexander, DePauw University; Clemewell Lay, Wellesley College; and Emerson Reck, Midland College.[107]

Although Lytton had scheduled a record number of speeches and discussions he did not forget the need for recreation. As a consequence delegates were introduced to barn dancing of the old-fashioned variety on Wednesday evening, were guests at a steak fry on Thursday night, and attended the Drake Relays on Saturday afternoon. For those who wished to stay over for Sunday there were tours of the city and a dinner at the Des Moines Country Club.[108]

At the final business meeting the delegates approved a proposal which called for the annual convention to be held in the central states in even-numbered years and in the outlying areas—the West, South, and East—in odd-numbered years. They next voted to go to the Far West for the first time in 1941 with the University of California, Berkeley, as the meeting site, Harold Ellis of that university as convention secretary, and late August the preferred time. Reports of officers and committees indicated that 1939-40 under Miss Mosely's leadership was proving to be a record year. Membership had climbed to 451 and new income had totaled $2,961. Additional revenue had been garnered by the introduction of convention booths in which firms having or desiring colleges as patrons were able to advertise their services. The Association's balance at the end of the fiscal year reached a new high of $1,318.[109]

The Committee on Awards recommended that "there be sufficient variety in the annual contests to provide for the different types of work done in the many publicity offices." It suggested a rotation system so that there would be no more than two contests in any one year.[37] The contests sponsored for 1940 resulted in first-place awards to Wittenberg College for pictorial literature, to the University of Texas for best coverage of an educational event, and to Boston University for the year's best educational feature.

As a result of recommendations made by the Committee on Awards and the Committee on Association Promotion, ACPA's Executive Committee later established two awards "for outstanding contributions." One would go "to the newspaper or magazine man or woman who makes an outstanding contribution to educational publicity," and the other would go "to the ACPA member who contributes most significantly to improving public relations of higher education in general."

The delegates also gave unanimous approval to the report of the Committee on Nominations which presented the following slate: President, W. Emerson Reck; vice presidents, Franklin Skeele, University of Southern California, membership; Elmer G. Sulzer, University of Kentucky, regions; Edward D. Whittlesey, Western Reserve University, research; Trennie Eisley, Bucknell University, women's activities; and E. C. Lytton, Drake, sports; secretary-treasurer, Russell Alexander, DePauw University; Association editor, Floyd Tifft, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Reappointed were Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma, as *Digest* associate editor and Allen M. Bailey, Oberlin, as *Digest* business manager.[110]

Miss Mosely's efforts to lead her colleagues to greater understanding of their growing opportunities and responsibilites were summed up in her presidential address on "The Interpreter Keeps Pace," delivered at the convention banquet.

"As workers for a better public understanding of education's intangibles," she asserted, "we stand on the front parapet of all action. Nor can we afford to risk a single shot that may go astray, nor yet lose, through laziness or carelessness, any opportunity no matter how minute. A better program designed to promote public understanding is one step in a progressive direction.

"The American public may be sold on the intrinsic values of its educational services, but it remains for the educational interpreter to open further the frontier of general understanding. He must show in concise form the vital relationship between the activities of the thinker and the doer. His destiny is becoming clearer. He is to become one of the strongest links throughout the world in the application of truth. He is to shape his service program on the basic thought that each act he performs is done, not alone for its timely value, or for its local stimulation, but for the ultimate good of humanity itself. . . .

"Let me cite two definite procedures which the educational interpreter, if he will make himself a genuine and effective craftsman, must follow.

"The high chiefs of press and radio, two of our most powerful channels for communication of ideas, are eager to cooperate with the educational interpreter. But our job entails first the responsibility of knowing where we are heading, and second, the responsibility of seeing that these persons understand our goal and their place in helping to reach it. The same holds true for our educational chiefs whose assistants we are. In tightening our professional standards as educational interpreters, we no longer have room for self-pity and complaints about these allied fields. The common goal of all three—communications, educators, and interpreters—is to secure a universal public understanding of the intangibles in human thought and conduct which will safeguard and enlighten our living of tomorrow and tomorrow. The successful working of the democratic order forces the shouldering of responsibilities. Our major task is to shoulder our own responsibilities."[111]

5

War Clouds Over the Land

Girding for New Responsibilities

During the four months following the Des Moines convention, ACPA's Executive Committee set four goals to serve as lodestars for the Association's 1940-41 activities. Greater service to members, it determined, would be the major objective for the year. The other objectives were: (1) to foster pride in dignified interpretation of higher education; (2) to create wider understanding and appreciation of ACPA aims and principles; (3) to promote greater appreciation of the opportunities and needs for cooperation in the interests of higher education.

Meanwhile, the president-elect, W. Emerson Reck, decided to leave Midland College where he had served as director of publicity and later as director of public relations for fourteen years. Like Robert X. Graham before him, Reck had been bitten by the writing bug during adolescence. He was among several thousand boys who produced the articles, stories, poems, and items forming the content of the weekly magazine of the Lone Scouts of America. Chance, however, steered him into publicity and public relations when he was expecting to continue the newspaper work which helped pay his expenses at Wittenberg College in his hometown of Springfield, Ohio. Wittenberg's dean, whom Reck saw almost daily in his work as a reporter, became president of Midland in 1925. The following spring he invited Reck, soon to be graduated, to become publicity director for the little Nebraska college.

Now in 1940 Colgate University was casting about for someone to establish a public relations office, and luck again favored Reck. Graham, a Colgate graduate, was consulted and urged the selection of ACPA's new president. Consequently, on September 1 Reck found himself faced with two new jobs.

With the first issue of *College Publicity Digest* for 1940-41, the new president established the practice of making monthly progress reports to the membership with a "Headquarters Communiqué." In his first communiqué he outlined the year's goals. Efforts to give greater service, he said, would be made in nine ways: "by (1) pushing plans for a central office with an executive secretary; (2) enlarging and improving the *Digest* and *Publicity Problems*; (3) carrying on a comprehensive research program planned to make a lasting contribution to education and educational interpretation; (4) giving increased attention to the peculiar problems of the woman's college and the sports publicity director; (5) holding successful meetings in every district; (6) holding in Berkeley, California, on August 10, 11, 12 and 13, 1941, a national program unsurpassed in scope and value; (7) inaugurating an employment service for the membership and institutions of recognized standing; (8) helping members solve specific problems through a service committee composed of ACPA members who are specialists in certain fields of public relations work; (9) assisting members to combine and coordinate the various phases of public relations work at individual institutions."

Pride in dignified interpretation would be fostered, he continued, by encouraging members to measure their efforts from the standpoint of quality instead of quantity, and by emphasizing the necessity for high ethical standards among all engaged in educational publicity work.

Efforts to create wider understanding of ACPA aims and principles would be made by working for greater understanding and appreciation of public relations among educators, and by working for increased prestige for ACPA through a carefully-planned program of interpretation.

"General appreciation of the opportunities and needs for cooperation in the interests of higher education," the president concluded, "will be sought in four ways: (1) by furthering among ACPA members the ideal of united service for education; (2) by offering closer cooperation with other organizations working specifically in the interests of higher education; (3) by working for better understanding of education on the part of the media through which ACPA members work; and (4) by inviting all institutions of recognized educational standing to share in the ACPA program."[1]

When ACPA's stationery for 1940-41 came from the press in September, it carried a slogan the Association used for twenty-one years: "United in the Service of Education." In many cases thereafter, however, the phrase "higher education" was used, for the adjective had been omitted inadvertentally by the printer when the stationery was first produced.

Although *College Publicity Digest* retained its 6 × 8¾ format of the past four years, it had a new look with the publication of Number 1, Volume 23. Color was introduced as a permanent feature of the front cover and different body and headline types gave the publication an almost entirely "different appearance."[2]

Fund raising was the topic of the lead article in the September issue of the *Digest*. In the article "College Gold," Joseph M. Murphy, director of public relations at Catholic University, emphasized the importance of continuing public relations efforts with alumni and community. His article set forth principles used by fund raisers ever afterward. Murphy listed appeal, organization and leadership, available money, and publicity as the four basic essentials upon which a campaign must be founded to be successful.[3]

"Under appeal," Murphy said, "is the good name of the college based upon a record of work well done." The college's standing in the community, evidence that graduates have received valuable training, evidence of reasonably efficient financial managemant, good relations with business men of the city, and student and faculty relationships of quality with the community were listed as factors which determine how a campaign is received locally.

"When it comes to organization and leadership of the campaign," said Murphy, "the very top leaders in thought and business are none too good as the heads of committees, teams of solicitors, or other groups engaged in the work. Without top leadership and efficient effort on their part, money in large sums cannot be procured. Lip service is not enough; leaders must lead, they must attend meetings, they must work hard."

Commenting on the factor of available money, Murphy said that a campaign will produce nothing but disappointment if it starts at the wrong time of year or when other conditions are unfavorable. Those considering the feasibility of a campaign should, according to Murphy, ask themselves three questions: "Is this the time to go to the community for funds?" "For how much should we ask?" "Can we raise this sum?"

The fourth basic essential, publicity, must be of the finest and the best, Murphy asserted. It must have educative value. Direct mail, the author emphasized, has the most telling effect. "Successive pieces, when followed by personal calls, usually achieve the most desired result," he said.

Emphasizing that personal calls are vital to the success of a campaign, Murphy added that workers for funds must "elevate their sights, think in larger terms than those of their customary life, and make their effort a selling one and not a begging one."

"People expect to be asked for something definite," he said. "They do not have an exact idea of what is correct, proper, or fair, and they welcome a suggestion. Even though the amount mentioned is higher than the prospect cares to give, a contribution below this sum still may be many times what the prospect would have given if left to himself."

The September *Digest* also carried the first of a four-article series written for the magazine by college presidents. In his piece, Charles Edwin Friley of Iowa State College emphasized the value of "balanced-diet" publicity as compared to "shot-in-the-arm" and "head-in-the-sand" publicity.[4]

Shot-in-the-arm publicity, another term for ballyhoo, according to Friley, obtains notoriety for an institution rather than understanding and respect. "An institution seeking notoriety may get the public eye," he said, "but I am sure that it doesn't get the public respect. . . .

"Head-in-the-sands publicity," he continued, "is dominated by fear. It is the negative public relations policy which attempts to censor the picture that the public gets of an institution and its work. It is afraid to let the public know all the facts. When the winds of adversity or mischance begin to blow, it sticks its head in the sand and refuses to see, to talk, or to listen. . . . Such an attempt to dodge the responsibility of giving out the facts, when the facts are derogatory . . . merely leads to uncontrolled rumor and to exaggeration."

Discussing balanced-diet publicity, Friley reemphasized points he had stressed in Harral's survey of college presidents, reported at the 1939 convention. "It recognizes," he said, "the obligation of an institution to report . . . what it is doing in a fair, full, and frank manner . . . [and] the advantage . . . of building long-time prestige on a policy of continuous, nonsensational, reporting of its activities, policies, accomplishments—and failures."

In an October article entitled "Why College Publicity?" President Mildred H. McAfee of Wellesley said, "Colleges need to be known in order to be appreciated in order to be attended in order to be supported in order to be worth knowing. . . . More thoughtful and, I strongly suspect, more generous people are honestly more interested in the intellectual achievements of an institution of higher learning. Spokesmen for institutions cannot distort the emphasis in college life without threatening the integrity of the institution, and that is too valuable an asset to be trifled with. . . . Dramatizing the commonplace is never an easy job, especially when what is now commonplace has had to be achieved gradually by dint of hard work. The commonplace of an academic community is, however, its glory, and the permanent friends of colleges want that aspect of its life presented to their friends. Mature men and women are ashamed to indicate loyalty to an institution which presents itself to the public primarily as a haven for adolescent trivialities. . . . If that group is to be kept appreciative of the college, they must find in it genuinely significant values. Publicity officers have the chance to keep those values within sight."[5]

What the college administrator expects of his publicity director and what the latter has a right to expect of the administration were outlined by President Hugh P. Baker of Massachusetts State College in the January *Digest*.

"The publicity director," according to Baker, "must be able to see the college or university as a whole, must be adept at techniques, and must be awake to develop new avenues of publicity and public relations. The administrator," he added, "may demand of the publicity director a statement of his plan for the whole publicity program insofar as it relates to his particular work. He has a right to expect that the publicity director can win and hold the good will of the media which he serves with news, and he expects that the publicity man should function as an interpreter rather than as a high-pressure salesman. . . .

"In my opinion," Baker concluded, "this is what the college publicity director may expect of the college administrator: (1) that the administrator will realize that in his hands to a large degree lies the success or failure of a publicity program; (2) that the administrator will give the publicity department the support of the administration in seeking cooperation from others on the staff; (3) that he will give the publicity department cooperation in the treatment of unfavorable news, when and if such news arises; (4) that he will keep the publicity department informed of developments which later may form a background for interpretation of the news events arising from them."[6]

Drawing upon his years of experience as a public relations officer in both the business and college fields, Louis C. Boochever of Cornell University, president of ACPA in 1931-33, offered a "Decalogue of Public Relations" printed as a *Digest* feature:

> I. Never join the issue on a triviality. (You will get a reputation for being petty.)
>
> II. Never join the issue on a charge that is made by an irresponsible party. (You besmirch yourself in descending from your level.)
>
> III. A denial never catches up with an affirmation. (Ten-point type is smaller than thirty-six point.)
>
> IV. Whenever possible insist on your side of the story being told simultaneously with the opposite side. (Proper timing gives the public a chance to form its own conclusions.)
>
> V. Never becloud an issue with countercharges. (The reaction is: "I fear my lady doth protest too much.")
>
> VI. Do not hesitate to correct misstatements of fact. (The American public may be expected to draw the proper conclusions from irrefutable facts.)
>
> VII. Never forget the amenities even if you have been denied them. (The public goes along with the good sport.)
>
> VIII. Remember that the newspapers and the public generally react with an innate sense of decency and fair play. (Public opinion is sound and honest.)
>
> IX. Discourage writing letters to the editor on matters of opinion. (The editor has the last word.)
>
> X. Avoid prolongation of the argument. (News is a brief sensation; repetition gives it currency; there'll be a new sensation tomorrow.)[7]

"Stupid Public Relations," an article written by Thomas W. Parry, head of a St. Louis public relations firm, was the most direct and pointed piece appearing in *College Publicity Digest* in 1940-41.

"When we talk about public relations for a college we mean . . . the development of cordial, mutually helpful and mutually profitable relations between a college and the public it serves," Parry said. He then illustrated his conception of stupid public relations with a dozen examples from business.

"It must be apparent therefore," he continued, "that public relations is a two-way proposition. It places a very definite obligation upon the college. In . . . order to gain certain benefits it is necessary to contribute something. If the only purpose of public relations were to secure publicity . . . in the newspapers and magazines, there would be little justification for such a program. What a college should endeavor to do in line with its public relations policy is to contribute something of value to those sections of the public it serves. One of your first jobs, therefore, is to chart that public. . . .

"How, you may ask, does the college benefit? The answer is pretty obvious. By making a significant contribution or series of contributions, the college makes itself more widely and more favorably known whether through the medium of newspaper and magazine articles, word-of-mouth, newsreel, or radio. And when it makes itself more widely and favorably known, it is quite likely to be able to attract its capacity enrollment and also to attract the type of student which it desires. It is quite likely also to receive more gifts and endowments."[8]

Advertisers in newspapers and magazines were beginning at this time to see value in working the names of colleges into their advertising, sometimes with pictures. There was argument, pro and con, among colleges concerning the wisdom of cooperation. In a *Digest* article called "Should Colleges Permit Their Names in Ads?" Anne Wilder of Mount Holyoke College reported that about half of the colleges covered in a research project had "more or less definite policies" against the use of their names in commercial advertising. Reasons given for edicts against commercial advertising were: "merely the name of the college is publicized and not the college," "exploits student and college," and "emphasizes trivial matters." Miss Wilder urged that those colleges permitting use of their names in advertising channel all requests through their publicity office, meanwhile making certain that students and college administrators were kept fully informed about the policy.[9]

With most of Europe and a large part of the Orient aflame, war was much on the minds of Americans even in the pre-Pearl Harbor months. To most, it appeared that sooner or later the United States would be involved. Throughout 1940-41 ACPA gave considerable thought to its role in national defense. Four *Digest* articles—including one by President Meta Glass of Sweet Briar called "Women in the Present Crisis" in the February issue, dedicated as usual to women of the organization—related to national defense. Most district meetings gave some attention to the subject, and in March ACPA's president named a Committee on Action in Case of War.

Edward D. Whittlesey of Cleveland College, the Association's vice president for research, noted in a *Digest* article, "Front Lines on the Campus," that "higher education is in the front lines of the national defense program and college publicity directors are finding new and unusual munitions of educational warfare on their desks these days."

Whittlesey had started a study of "The Role of Higher Education in National Defense" even before assuming his research vice presidency in September, 1940. He was able to report that all but one of 100 institutions included in a cross-sectional survey already had either a committee or special activity devoted to national defense. Seventy of them had faculty committees studying "the problems of defense as they relate to education's future functions."

"Heading the list of activities," he reported, "is a program for building student and community morale and conviction. New courses in political science, economics, sociology, and history are planned. Old courses in literature, history, and speech are being 'democratized' to give students the special knowledge they will need in the battle of ideologies and 'isms'. There is nothing hysterical or sensational in these innovations. Flag-waving is being studiously avoided and only the best interest of democratic philosophy is being considered."

Included among other college programs conducted to help in the national defense, Whittlesey had discovered, were institutes and forums, conferences with defense officials and business executives to determine how colleges could help meet needs on the industrial front; emphasis on physical preparedness, health, and first aid; mobilization of research and testing services for defense use; special efforts to help train naval officers, aviators, doctors, dentists, signal corps officers, administrative and Red Cross workers, and technicians in chemical and ordnance work; and research into communicable disease and nutrition problems.[10]

The nation's press associations, many individual newspapers, and some magazines gave publicity to the Whittlesey study. Several scholarly journals also carried articles and the survey's findings were presented in February, 1941, at a Washington conference of nearly 500 college representatives sponsored by the National Committee on Education and Defense. Representing ACPA, Whittlesey had helped plan this conference at a December meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs of the American Council on Education.[11]

When ACPA held its 1941 convention at Berkeley, California, it heard a lengthy report from its Committee on Action in Case of War, headed by Frederick S. Osborne of Princeton. The delegates empowered the Exective Committee to carry out recommendations made. These included reaffirming ACPA's loyalty to the United States; pledging to President Roosevelt its whole-hearted support of the national cause; offering its facilities for the successful prosecution of that cause; transmitting to the Office of Government Reports (or to the head of whatever central government information bureau might subsequently be established) a statement setting forth the possibilities "for the promotion of the nation's objectives inherent in this organized, country-wide network of trained publicity men and women"; interpreting its labors in behalf of education, "an enterprise vital to the present and future welfare of the nation"; and giving consideration to the formulation of "significant cooperative projects and to dissemination of information to members, for possible adoption in other areas, of successful programs conducted by groups of colleges."

In miscellaneous observations in his report, Osborne emphasized the importance of public relations and publicity in the defense situation: "It is the function of a public relations director to help guide the thinking of his institution so that his college can set for itself a well-defined target representing its own most constructive course in the national emergency. . . . Publicity programs must reflect, as never before, the dignity and authority that is inherent to education and educational institutions. . . . The curtailment of newspaper space available to higher education has a silver lining. To merit publication, stories must be significant. Quality must now replace quantity—a transition already too long delayed in educational publicity."[12]

Involvement was a major objective for ACP[illegible]vities in 1940-41. When the year's committees were announced nearly 200, or approximately forty percent, of the Association's members were included. Only eight of the 200 invited had asked to be excused.[13]

Largest of the seventeen committees appointed was that for membership, announced in November with forty-nine members headed by Franklin B. Skeele of the University of Southern California, vice president for membership. The largest group ever concentrating on membership for ACPA, this committee would enable Skeele to report to the 1941 convention that membership had jumped to a new high of 554. Especially large was the growth in women members, whose number had increased twenty-nine percent and now made up nearly one-fourth of the Association's total.[14]

Second largest of the committees was that named to help members solve specific problems related to news, radio, publications, television, photography, movies, sports, and special events. Composed of specialists in the areas listed, this committee was activated as one of the steps with which the new officers hoped to give greater service for members. Committee members received inquiries individually, depending on their field of expertise. But the August, 1941, report of the chairman, Charles E. Widmayer of Dartmouth, indicated that the committee, with fourteen major suggestions, had also been active in proposing additional ways the Association might be of greater service to its members.[15]

The Association's president reported from month to month on progress made toward meeting the goals set by the Executive Committee. He announced in October that the *Digest* was to be made available to college presidents and libraries at reduced rates and that work had been started on a traveling exhibit to be sent from district to district. In January, he reported that the *World Almanac* in 1941, for the first time, would include ACPA among the national associations it listed. In February, he announced that a new membership record had already been set through the efforts of Frank Skeele and his committee, and that the new Placement Service would start functioning March 1 with a nominal charge to applicants ($2 for members and $5 for nonmembers) entitling them to two fifty-word classified advertisements in the *Digest* and to receive information concerning available jobs. In February, also, he announced that the purposes of ACPA and the desire of its members to cooperate had been explained in personal visits to more than thirty magazine and newspaper editors, radio, news reel, and press association officials, and officers of national publicity organizations. In April, he brought word that the Association's Credo, two years in preparation, was on the presses.

For the first time in its twenty-four years, ACPA on February 12, 1941, suffered the loss of one of its officers by death. On that day a heart attack took Edward C. Lytton of Drake University, vice president for sports activities, whose efforts the preceding year had given ACPA the most comprehensive convention program in its history. J. Willard Ridings of Texas Christian University, vice president for sports the preceding year, was appointed to serve out Lytton's term.

With the Association's convention scheduled for the Far West for the first time in history, the *Digest* carried articles and pictures almost monthly in an effort to assure a good attendance. A transportation committee, headed by Alexander Schreiber of Illinois Institute of Technology, worked with four railroads on special sight-seeing trips.

The famed *Challenger* of the North Western-Union Pacific was chosen as the official train for delegates with $92.70 set as the round-trip tourist pullman cost from Chicago, including a lower berth. To make the trip on the air-conditioned *Challenger* even more attractive, the railroad also promised to provide a lounge car and "serve satisfactory meals at reasonable prices": breakfast, thirty-five cents; luncheon, forty cents; dinner, fifty cents. To encourage members to come early and stay late, Convention Secretary Harold Ellis and his committee arranged for two days of sight-seeing opportunities before the convention opened, offered help in planning itineraries, and arranged for housing at prices ranging from $1 to $3, the latter figure for Berkeley's newest motor court.[16]

Chosen as convention headquarters was the Claremont Hotel, with its wide, rambling porches available for committee sessions and with its view over the Berkeley hills and Golden Gate Bay. The Claremont's gardens proved ideal for the convention's long-remembered "Evening in the South Seas with Trader Vic," during which delegates ate course after course of delectable, exotic food and tasted with increasing glow a tropical drink served in a scooped-out coconut.

When the convention opened at 9:30 a.m. on August 11, sixty-nine delegates from twenty states and Hawaii were on hand. Reporting on the convention, the editor of *College Publicity Digest* said:

"When the group adjourned fifty-four hours later it had heard a thought-provoking message from President Roosevelt; heard fifteen addresses related to the theme, 'Publicity for Education and America'; discussed common problems at breakfast meetings; heard an alumnus, a parent, a citizen, a professor, and a college president discuss 'If I Were a College Publicity Director'; approved reports of fifteen committees; applauded a twenty-two percent increase in membership and the reports of all eleven officers; presented three awards for distinguished service and outstanding achievement; awarded prizes for outstanding convention exhibits; upped membership dues to $10; overhauled the constitution; voted the second honorary membership authorized in the Association's twenty-four years; pledged ACPA to assist in meeting the needs outlined by President Roosevelt; directed the Executive Committee to assure full ACPA cooperation to the Civilian Defense Program; adopted a twenty-two point code of ethics; chosen Columbus, Ohio, as the site of the Silver Anniversary convention; elected new officers."[17]

President Roosevelt sent a message to President Reck, pointing out important needs of the nation. Read at the opening session of the convention, the message said in part:

"The message I would emphasize to you this year is that America will always need men and women with college training. Government and industry alike need skilled technicians today. Later we shall need men and women of broad understanding and special aptitudes to serve as leaders of the generation which must manage this post-war world. We must, therefore, redouble our efforts during these critical times to make our schools and colleges render ever more efficient service in support of our cherished democratic institutions."[18]

Keynoter for the convention was G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Boston area, and former president of DePauw University. Speaking on the convention theme, "Publicity for Education and America," he emphasized that "American education must prepare men for freedom, equip them to create and maintain freedom, so ground them in a sense of values that they see in free men the ultimate good. Insofar as we extend the democratic ideal and make it the practice of common life, we create an America about which the truth need but be told. Insofar as education gives the mind and will essential to the task, it is but necessary 'to publicize its intrinsic nature'."[19]

"A university is not last but first among the weapons in the arsenal of democracy," said Robert G. Sproul of the University of California, one of three other college presidents participating in the convention program.

"It is a vast reservoir of knowledge accumulated through generations and centuries by the free, unhampered search for truth. It is a tremendous generating plant, supplying a steady flow of power to the democratic machine. It is for you to see that these facts are made known widely, for they are far from obvious. The man in the street seldom, if ever, sees the connection between the abstruse activities of our scholars and the general well being of himself and his neighbors. It is for you to keep the line clear between the power plant and the people, thus assuring them that the university has new life for them as well as for the youngsters who gather in the shadow of its buildings.

"It is your task, also, to reassure the public as to the fundamental Americanism of our higher educational institutions in the face of their special function to provide a place in which men seek to discover every question which concerns mankind, and fearless statement of the conclusions reached, no matter how unpopular they may be."[20]

Speaking on "Public Relations for the Publicity Director," Al C. Joy, public relations counsel for Pacific Gas and Electric Company, emphasized that "publicity and public relations are two totally different jobs."

"Public relations after all," he said, "means the public attitude toward a business, and public relations work is the work of creating good will. . . . Publicity is an essential and an important part of public relations work, but public relations work is in itself not publicity work. We conduct classes for our counter clerks so that they may learn to meet the public courteously. This is public relations; it is not publicity. We invite customers to visit our properties, and friendly guides escort them and give them information. This is public relations; it is not publicity."[21]

Rex Harlow, president of the American Council on Public Relations, spoke in a similar vein when he said: "I look upon public relations as the broad sweep of human relations. Consequently, everything we think, everything we do, has to do with public relations."[22]

The subject of public relations for ACPA, long advocated by Eleanor Mosely, had been considered so important that a committee headed by Stewart Harral of the University of Oklahoma had been included among the seventeen appointed for 1940-41. Later in the Berkeley convention Harral's committee expressed belief that there could be "no highly unified program of public relations for ACPA" until a national executive office had been established.

The committee also recommended a ten-point program meant to raise the professional status of the college publicist by: "(1) encouraging members to write articles for educational journals and magazines; (2) providing wider distribution of ACPA publications among administrators and faculty members; (3) providing outstanding speakers from ACPA to address meetings of educational groups; (4) displaying ACPA exhibits at meetings of educational associations; (5) encouraging administrators to give publicists titles in keeping with their duties, and urging them not to look upon their directors as 'errand boys' rather than administrative officials; (6) impressing administrators with the fact that an effective publicity program demands a competent director, a budget to fit the particular needs, complete cooperation from the institutional staff, necessary office workers, and ample facilities; (7) discouraging members from releasing questionable art to any medium; (8) reprimanding any member who resorts to tricks, ballyhoo, or other unethical means to publicize any phase of higher education; (9) providing some sort of training, either through publications or lectures, for inexperienced persons in the profession, this instruction emphasizing that the governing law in public relations is that they shall be honest, truthful, open, authoritative, and responsible . . . ; (10) reminding members of the need for complete cooperation and loyalty toward the Association and higher education in general." The report was referred to the Executive Committee for action.[23]

The dream of a central office was not to be realized for almost a decade, but most of the other recommendations made by Harral's committee would be implemented. In her report to the convention, Eleanor Mosely, immediate past-president of the Association and now chairman of the committee which eventually made the dream come true, said that contacts made during the year with individuals, associations, and foundations who loomed as possible sponsors of a central office project had been maintained and that several new leads were being followed up. However, she commented, "In every case national and world conditions have provided a barrier to definite progress."[24]

Turning their attention to publicity planning, the convention delegates heard William P. St.Sure, vice president and general manager of the East Bay Transit Company and Key System, emphasize that "an elementary prerequisite of any sound publicity must be the giving of the best possible service."

"Publicity, viewed in its whole relation," St.Sure asserted, "is essentially a form of salesmanship through the printed word. One section of it is advertising, but publicity in its entirety comprises all and every method by which the character of an individual or a corporation is established with the public. . . .

"The only publicity which is worthwhile, the only publicity which is worthy of the name, is founded on the legitimate desire to establish the truth. Publicity is not to be thought of as a sort of umbrella to protect against the rain of unpleasant opinion. In adopting a policy of publicity, every company or individual should establish clearly to its own satisfaction that it is pursuing a policy in its affairs which is as reasonable as, under the conditions, it can pursue."[25]

Upon the basis of a report made by the Committee on Awards headed by Arthur L. Brandon of the University of Texas, the delegates added a constitutional bylaw making official an action taken by the Exective Committee a year earlier. This bylaw authorized the presentation of four awards annually, one to not more than two persons who had given distinguished and unselfish service as ACPA members over a period of years, one to the member who had done the most effective job of educational publicity during the year, one to the member who had done the most effective job of sports publicity, and one to a nonmember individual, publication, institution, or organization which had done the most to interpret higher education to the general public.

Action authorized by the new bylaw was implemented later in the convention when three of the four awards were presented for the first time. Josef F. Wright of the University of Illinois, who had been active in the Association since 1919, first as its secretary and later as its president, became the first person to receive the award for distinguished and unselfish service over a period of years. The award to the member doing the most effective job of educational publicity during the fiscal year went to Arthur Wild, who had directed Harvard's tercentenary and made it "education's greatest show window." The New York *Times*, lauded for its "sincere interest in the progress of education to the end that life might be made happier and more useful for all," received the nonmember award for distinguished service in the interpretation of education. Presentation of the first award for the most effective job of sports promotion was postponed until 1941.

The new bylaw also continued the provision for honorary membership adopted in 1938. A committee headed by John DeCamp recommended that the honor be bestowed upon Erwin D. Canham, managing editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*. He would be invited to receive the honor in person during the Silver Anniversary convention a year hence.[26]

Other constitutional revisions created three new elective offices: vice president for radio activities, associate editor, and advertising manager of publications; spelled out the duties of officers in detail; made two years of active membership a requisite for election to a national office and two years of service in national offices a requisite for election to the presidency; revamped the district organization slightly; tightened fiscal control, and, as indicated earlier, upped annual dues to $10.[27]

In adopting recommendations made by the Committee on Resolutions headed by Gertrude M. Hall of Illinois State Normal University, the delegates "accepted President Roosevelt's message as a challenge to the

Association" and promised "to do their utmost to assist their respective institutions in meeting the needs mentioned by the President." They authorized the Executive Committee "to effect immediately the organization necessary for assuring cooperation with the Civilian Defense Program"; urged each member college to assemble cuts for which it had no further use, remove the zinc and copper metal for contribution to national defense needs, and, through the Executive Committee working with the proper defense officers, arrange for disposition of the salvaged metal; and authorized a request to the Council on National Defense that a clearinghouse be established for educational news originating at the colleges and universities and promising to be of interest to publications in South and Central America.[28]

The Code of Ethics adopted unanimously at Berkeley spoke out strongly against the suppression of "unfavorable news," attempts to pass free advertising off as news, the use of "ambiguous or vague statements in releases that may give . . . editors a false impression of our institution," "misrepresentation in the use of posed or exaggerated pictures," stunt publicity in any form "as a method of obtaining the public eye," use of " 'leg art' as handled by certain types of magazines and newpapers as . . . beneath the dignity of our organization," and the acceptance of pay by the publicity director for newspaper stories written as a routine part of his work.

It also called for the use in all publicity of "exact enrollment figures as recorded officially by the college," for any released advance list of candidates for degrees to be "an accurate official graduating list, if at all obtainable," for less emphasis on "queen-crowning events," for members to refrain "from any competitive publicity that would tend to belittle" other educational institutions, and for the publicity director to give his time "primarily to straight-forward publicity for the college and not to press-agenting any particular individual." Finally, the code recommended that, "in behalf of ACPA as an organization of high professional standing, some method of dealing with unethical practices be developed whereby protests may be officially registered with the offending member. In flagrant violations of accepted policies the suspension of membership might be a consideration."[29] The code, drawn by a committee headed by Roy N. Walters of Berea College, replaced the Standards of Practice adopted thirteen years earlier.

Fears were expressed in mid year that the Association would run a deficit in 1940-41 because of increased costs resulting from adding color to the *Digest*, publication and mailing of the Credo, the stepped up membership campaign, publication and distribution of the much-enlarged convention report for 1940, and the increased expenses involved in taking the 1941 convention to the Far West. The anxiety proved groundless when Secretary-Treasurer Alexander made his report. After all expenses had been covered, the Association's balance at the end of the fiscal year stood at $1,741, up approximately $425 over September 1, 1940.[30]

Adopted unanimously, the report of the Committee on Nominations called for the following slate of officers for 1941-42: President, J. Willard Ridings, Texas Christian University; vice presidents, Arthur L. Brandon, University of Texas, membership; Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma, research; Harold Ellis, University of California, regions; Hugh Fogarty, Creighton University, radio; Clemewell Lay, Wellesley College, women's activities; and Horace Renegar, Tulane University, athletics; secretary-treasurer, Edward D. Whittlesey, Western Reserve University; editor, Floyd Tifft, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; associate editor, John F. Sembower, Indiana State Teachers College; advertising manager, Alexander Schreiber, Illinois Institute of Technology; and convention secretary, Harold K. Schellenger, Ohio State University. Columbus, Ohio, had previously been selected as the 1942 convention site upon recommendation of the Committee on Silver Anniversary.[31]

Addressing the delegates on "The Challenges of Tomorrow" at the final luncheon session, President Reck outlined five challenges he perceived.

"The first is that we set higher standards of membership," he declared. 'Year in and year out we hear from editors during our conventions, and invariably these editors talk in terms of fundamentals. Moreover, a visit with the average news editor will reveal that he is receiving reams of college publicity which violate many of the rudimentaty rules of news writing. These facts reveal that some colleges at least have a mistaken notion about publicity, the important role it plays, and the type of individual best fitted to do satisfactory interpretative work. For the best interests of the Association, its members, and higher education in general, it seems that we might well consider the wisdom of raising standards for membership and henceforth emphasizing the value of quality rather than of quantity.

"The second challenge is that we assimilate our members, imbuing each with the Association's ideals of honesty, accuracy, and service. We feel that much progress has been made through the adoption of a creed and the establishment of a Code of Ethics, but there seems to be no good reason why ACPA could not establish standards similar to those of the medical and law professions with the provision that members failing to measure up would be eliminated. . . .

"Our third challenge is to promote greater understanding of our public relations programs among our own administrators. Throughout the nation there seems to be a sad lack of understanding of public relations work and objectives by presidents, deans, and others in administrative positions. Let us make every effort to get closer to these officers on our own campuses and to promote activities which will bring greater appreciation of public relations work. It is possible that this organization could sponsor publicity and public relations conferences and workshops which would help to gain the objectives in mind.

"Another challenge," the president continued, "is that of inspiring united effort on the part of institutions of higher learning. Disgraceful competition, shameful bickering, and unbecoming jealousies have obtained in not a few areas and this lack of idealism on the part of colleges and universities has been harmful to all education. Members of ACPA can do much to eliminate such unworthy activities and in doing so they will increase their own prestige and that of the institutions they represent.

"Lastly, we face the challenge to cooperate and, where possible to lead, in the defense of democracy. We all know that democracy is threatened and when democracy is threatened so too is our system of education. These are days to test our mettle. These are days when we must think beyond the newspaper pages. We already have had indications that some colleges are riding the defense wagon in a selfish search for publicity. This should be the case no longer. Rather let us determine that our every effort from this day forward shall present our institutions with honesty and accuracy and sincerity; that indeed our efforts in every instance shall be interpretation at its very best for the sake not only of our own institutions but of democracy and the future of our nation.

"These, my friends, are some of the challenges as I see them. ACPA has come a long way up the hill during the past twenty-four years. Many and fine have been its contributions. But there is more, much more to do. Ours today is the greatest opportunity in education. Ours today is also the greatest responsibility in education. On our shoulders, I firmly believe, rests much of the future of education and America. Let us here highly resolve that no one in the days to come shall ever be able to say that you and I were tried and found wanting in these days of crisis for education and America."[32]

Little Time to Celebrate

Greater service to members,—with the emphasis on improving *College Publicity Digest*, providing more reports on current publicity practices, increasing research aimed at finding answers to vexing publicity problems, enlarging placement activities, and giving greater help of a practical nature to the Association's younger and less experienced members—was the major goal of ACPA in the year 1941-42. Another goal given almost as much emphasis was the celebration of the Association's twenty-fifth anniversary at its Silver Jubilee convention, to be held in Columbus, birthplace of the organization.[33]

Then came Pearl Harbor and the focus of ACPA, like that of nearly all organizations, centered increasingly on the war effort. Rapidly increasing production costs, accompanied by decreasing membership resulting from war-induced problems and the doubling of dues as voted in the preceding August, spoiled some of the plans for increased service, among them hopes for enlarging the *Digest*. Ultimately, it was decided to publish eight rather than the usual nine issues of the magazine. A survey of the publication's contents reemphasizes the values it must have had, especially in a year when the number of young and less experienced individuals entering the college publicity field was increasing rapidly. Techniques of publicity were emphasized as never before. Articles for the year stressed such subjects as news bureau operation, science writing, printing methods, photography, direct mail, and broadcasting.

At the same time older members of the Association showed increasing concern about the role of higher education during the war and in the years beyond. President Ridings, who was continuing the practice of reporting to members each month through "Headquarters Communiqué," devoted much of his space in the December-January issue of the *Digest* to the ideas of Donald K. Anderson of the University of Michigan.

"There seems to be no blinking the fact that we must face . . . another long period of economic distress and acute social disruption, perhaps even worse than that [the Great Depression] which we have just gone through," Anderson said. "If this is true, colleges and universities, and all education, for that matter, will certainly suffer unless the story of education is brought clearly and strikingly before the constituencies that maintain our institutions.

"I seriously doubt if this broad, overall job can be done by the isolated and uncorrelated efforts of our individual offices, although the cumulative effect of all these efforts is great."[34]

Anderson suggested that ACPA, through whatever channels possible, assist in setting up some agency which would devote itself to telling, without institutional bias, the whole story of education's contribution in war and in peace. Ridings announced that Anderson had been named chairman of a committee to investigate possibilities along the lines suggested and report at the Columbus convention.

After a study of possibilities, Anderson and his Committee on Educational Service emphasized that "if the Association is to undertake this task, our need for a central office and a full-time secretary will be more evident than it is now." His committee then recommended that an officer or a committee "be authorized to collect and disseminate information concerning the wartime contributions of American colleges and universities for the ACPA and that funds be made available for this purpose."[35] Presidents of subsequent years sought to carry out this recommendation with only moderate success. Few members could find the time for so large an assignment after meeting the demands faced on their own campuses.

The importance of the Silver Jubilee convention scheduled for May 7-9 was emphasized increasingly by Ridings and his fellow officers. It not only would mark a great milestone in the Association's history, but also would tie in with the war effort.

"The present international situation," the Association president wrote shortly after Pearl Harbor, "has disrupted the regular work routine for almost all of us, in most cases resulting in additional duties and longer working hours. No one can say just what is ahead. Our silver anniversary meeting looms more important than ever. Discussions, talk, and reports there will aid in clarifying the part that we may have in serving our country and the cause of higher education during the emergency."[36]

By February, Ridings had decided that committee work during the year should be kept at the absolute minimum. "All ACPA members," he announced, "are finding an unprecedented rush of duties piling up as the schools gird themselves for the war effort. . . . The load to be carried is being distributed as much as possible, [and] only committee work that must be done is assigned."

Meanwhile, Ridings encouraged members to keep their standards of performance high. "ACPA," he wrote in an earlier issue, "stands for a dignified interpretation of all phases of college activity. Unfortunately, the spectacular and bizarre are easy stories to handle and easy to get into print. But serious stories on worthwhile educational activities and achievements can be written and newspapers will publish them. In the long run, what hurts one educational institution hurts all; what helps one helps all. We must think more of what is beneficial in general."[37]

Other officers also urged greater attention to quality through the pages of the *Digest*. In his "Things Here and to Come" space in November, Editor Floyd Tifft wrote:

> "With the news situation tightening up the way it is for all kinds of news, except that relating to the war, we are faced with greater problems. First, we must try to improve our competency to judge what is newsworthy. . . .
>
> "When editors are harassed by unending floods of news of a world falling apart, we can do ACPA, higher education, and ourselves no greater damage than to send them material which indicates on the part of our institutions a tragic lack of vital usefulness or upon ourselves a sickening lack of comprehension of what merits space in these times. . . .
>
> " 'Hell's bells, don't they know there's a war!' many an editor snarls with bitter disgust and contempt as he scans publicity releases—some of which are from us. Neither higher education nor ourselves can afford this. Better to close our offices, but better still to operate them with competent persons."[38]

To give special help to the neophytes who were appearing in large numbers on ACPA's roster, Research Vice President Stewart Harral put under his microscope 400 news stories released by fifteen representative colleges and universities over a six-week period.

"Far ahead in the parade of faults are leads," he reported. "Too many are dull, trite, lacking in life. Some are sluggish, lazy, or anemic." Other leads, he said, were crowded or unsuited to the story material. Too many stories editorialized, were sloppy and unattractive, overlong, or lacking in reader interest. Quoting specific cases for emphasis, Harral criticized the use of words and phrases incomprehensible to the man on the street and commented that "it is evident that some publicity writers have forgotten that they are interpreters."[39]

Defense-related activities of the Association and its members received major attention of the officers and the *Digest* after Pearl Harbor. Several weeks before that catalyzing event, Ridings had moved to implement the recommendation of the 1941 convention that a Committee on Cooperation With National Defense be established. An extension of the Committee on Cooperation in Case of War which functioned in 1940-41, the new committee also had Frederick S. Osborne of Princeton as its chairman. By the end of December its membership included individuals from thirty-two states. Most defense agencies were being organized upon a state-unit basis and Ridings was consequently trying to secure a committeeman from each state. Each committeeman was then to cooperate with the various agencies within his state as need and opportunity arose.[40]

At Ridings' request Osborne represented ACPA at a national conference on higher education and the war, sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education and the Committee on Military Officers of the National Committee on Education and Defense. Approximately 1,000 college administrators attended the convention in Baltimore, Maryland, in January. Osborne passed along to his ACPA colleagues through the *Digest* those suggestions of the conference having special importance to college publicity directors.[41]

"It was suggested," he wrote, "that the college publicity director might give the benefit of his experience to state and municipal civilian defense public relations committees which are encharged [sic] not only with the immediate duty of disseminating information about civil defense practices, but also with the long-range responsibility of building morale, translating into local terms Washington decrees, such as tire rationing, conducting campaigns against waste, etc. It was further suggested that colleges might supply speakers for groups or that faculty members might be tapped for expert opinions on war subjects for public consumption."

The U.S. Office of Education, Osborne reported, had also been asked "to assemble and publish accounts of changes made by educational institutions in the interest of war service." Publicity directors could help implement this request by sending copies of releases and pamphlets describing significant adaptations of their colleges' normal programs to war conditions. The Office of Education, Osborne added, requested cooperation with its Civilian Morale Service, designed primarily to encourage "face-to-face discussion and group study . . . for the development of a national unity based on an understanding of common dangers and of plans and policies to meet dangers."

Osborne also spoke at the Columbus convention, this time with a sense of frustration.[42] Members of his committee had placed themselves and their colleagues at the disposal of state defense heads, but states, with few exceptions, had not taken advantage of the offers. Colleges in New Jersey, however, had proceeded on their own to present to state citizens a composite picture of New Jersey education girded for war. Virginia and Tennessee colleges were following suit and the committee urged similar action by other colleges on a city-, state-, or section-wide basis.

Osborne's committee had also explored the possibilities for harnessing the promotional power of ACPA and its members directly to the defense machine through a central service bureau. The result had not been encouraging.

"The situation has been canvassed thoroughly without avail," Osborne reported. "Some agencies have listened with polite boredom. Others have listened not at all. Some have been helpful. The proposed bureau would require financing, and where financing could be obtained the committee knoweth not . . . The only solution would seem to be the establishment within an existing government information agency—or some agency yet to be formed—of such a bureau." As will be revealed later, the efforts of the committee and similar committees which followed were not without positive results. The help of ACPA and its members was sought increasingly as the war progressed.

Defense-related activities also came into focus on the campuses of many of ACPA's member colleges and universities after Pearl Harbor. Butler University was one of the first to organize its students, faculty members, and administrative officers into emergency war committees for the dual purpose "of surveying every potentiality for use in the defense program and appraising every possibility of maintaining the school and improving it for the duration and the subsequent postwar reconstruction period."

Butler's publicity program itself was analyzed and definitely slanted to reflect the activities of the university in their relation to the war and to the postwar period. The most ambitious part of the publicity program was a series of articles, published over a period of weeks, on the aims and purposes of education as they related to the training of young men and women to assume the responsibilities of leadership in the reconstruction period. Articles emphasized education and its advantages in general. Butler's name was mentioned only in an editor's note preceding each article and incidentally in the story.[43]

Dartmouth, through Publicity Director Charles E. Widmayer, reported that it had organized forty faculty members to prepare short, signed articles dealing with national and international topics within their specialized fields. Usually in the form of letters to the editor, the articles went to approximately 100 newspapers throughout the country, all of which had been queried in advance with information about the American Defense Dartmouth Group and what it was trying to accomplish.

"This . . . work," Widmayer commented, "has all added to the sum total of what we consider good public relations—good because the college to some extent is sharing its faculty assets with the public and also is giving additional reality to the postulate that it exists fundamentally for the national welfare."[44]

Before Pearl Harbor and increasingly thereafter, the "Publicity Parade" section of the *Digest* announced resignations or leaves of absence as ACPA members left their jobs to enter the armed forces. Among those departing was Alexander Schreiber, business manager for the magazine. Ridings promptly named Roy K. Wilson of Eastern Illinois State Teachers College to take Schreiber's place.[45] Wilson continued to hold this job for the better part of the decade.

More and more articles written by ACPA members contained information on the war effort. The *Digest* in March, 1942, devoted nearly five pages to the "Code of Wartime Practices for the American Press" provided by the U.S. Office of Censorship. In summary, the restrictions covered the general character and movement of troops; the location, movement, and identity of naval and merchant ships; the disposition, movement, and strength of Army and Navy air units; the location of forts, coast-defense emplacements, bomb shelters, and camouflaged objects; information on war contracts and production; weather forecasts other than those issued by the Weather Bureau; photographs and maps; casualty lists; new location of the national archives; damage to military objectives; and movements of the President of the United States. "A maximum accomplishment will be attained," the Office of Censorship said, "if editors will ask themselves with respect to any given detail 'Is this information I would like to have if I were the enemy?' and then act accordingly."[46]

Nationally-broadcast radio programs were by this time courting the colleges with a view toward using student talent, often with scholarship funds as rewards. Although some colleges had been disappointed or embarrassed by results, a survey made for the *Digest* by Lillian Gardner of New Jersey College for Women indicated that by cooperating "there is a good deal to be gained, and little or nothing to be lost—*if* you are sure of your sponsor." Most colleges, she had discovered, had no fixed policy regarding participation in such programs but considered each proposition individually and based their decisions on the merits of the proposal. Many colleges were naming radio advisory committees to work with their public relations offices.

"Most colleges feel that the product which the advertiser sells is definitely a factor in influencing their decision," Miss Gardner wrote. "Everything, the colleges agree, depends on the sponsor. If the sponsor recognizes the purposes of a college and is willing to plan a broadcast in which a college might feel it could participate with dignity, the colleges are in favor of the tie-up."[47]

The use of other types of advisory groups was increasing among college publicity and public relations departments as the responsibilities of these departments grew during the war. Research Vice President Stewart Harral reported that a survey of sixty-seven representative colleges had revealed that twenty-six were using faculty groups in their interpretative activities.[48] These groups, known variously as communications, public contacts, public relations, extramural relations, resources, and publicity committees, varied in size from five members to twenty-seven. Members of some served by invitation of the publicity director, others by election in the faculty, still others by presidential appointment. Several of the colleges also reported the use of alumni, trustee, and student committees in their public relations efforts.

"Any sound program of public relations involves the services and counsel of several groups because each has a share and a responsibility in the interpretation of higher education," asserted Harral, who earlier in the year had published *Public Relations for Higher Education*.

A secretary, Charlotte Rossi of Ohio Wesleyan University, authored an article in the *Digest* entitled "Memo on the Boss." Her article listed ten traits which she said made Publicity Director Gerald W. Young tick.

"Perhaps what makes him tick will help others do the same," she said in presenting the ten points, with elaborations: "(1) He's willing to learn—listens patiently, reads everything he can get his hands on, never closes his door, goes everywhere asking questions. (2) He gives his staff a break—with choice assignments and bylines. (3) He doesn't try to do everything himself—helps develop the potentialities of his associates. (4) He believes in common courtesy—when someone does him a favor or service, he not only says he appreciates it but shows that he does. (5) He doesn't argue—recognizes that there are at least two sides to most questions,—says frankly what he thinks, then stops. (6) He never forgets—remembers kids' birthdays, wedding anniversaries, newspaper deadlines, acts of kindness. (7) He's tough—when he says something, he means it, and sticks with it today and tomorrow. (8) He isn't a pest—visits as many media as he can but doesn't call in person with every story and demand that it be used then and there. (9) He'd rather write than eat. (10) He sells the school, not individual releases."[49]

Publicity directors who failed to interpret their work to members of the faculty and administration were to blame for their own "family troubles." John F. Sembower of Indiana State Teachers College warned ACPA members in a thought-provoking article.

"I believe that it is almost as important for him to interpret his own program to his colleagues on the faculty and in the administration as it is for him to interpret their respective programs to the public at large," Sembower declared.

"The publicity director should remember," he continued, "that ordinarily his department is established by administrators with only a hazy idea of what they want it to accomplish. Only a few members of the faculty have any idea of what a publicity program is all about. The others have attitudes ranging from those believing that it is a necessary evil to those who look at it with complete suspicion." Sembower also advocated use of a faculty committee as "a valuable adjunct . . . as an interpreting agency from the publicity director to the faculty itself."[50]

Publicity directors, by omission rather than commission, were largely to blame for the fact that movies, books, and stories about Joe College "glorified the trivial, irrelevant, silly aspects of college life that simply do not exist," James H. Case, Jr., wrote accusingly in the *Digest*.[51]

"The college life portrayed in the popular vehicles of entertainment is something that no longer exists and probably never did," the secretary at Brown University contended. "The real point is that college publicity offices seem entirely willing to allow the popular version of the college student as a delightful, irresponsible prankster to stand without any vigorous, positive challenge. . . . Publicity directors may say they are not educators. I say they should be. At any rate, it is their business to understand colleges. If they don't, they certainly can do no reporting that accomplishes the only objective which seems to me worth a second thought—interpreting the college to the public."

Case urged that each publicity office draw up a concise statement of the real objectives for which the college or university was working. Formulating such a list, he said, would be bound to force attention upon primary goals.

"As interpreters, as educators," Case said, "publicity directors must ask themselves a searching question: 'Does this story add to the insight of the public into what my institution stands for and is doing?' "

Although criticism was being leveled at some members of ACPA because of their inexperience or lack of perspective, the reaction of newsmen and news organizations generally to the work of college publicists was increasingly favorable.

"The American College Publicity Association has reason to be proud," Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York *Times*, said in an article entitled "Public Forms Opinion of Colleges by What It Sees in the Press." "A quarter of a century has meant a maturation, a coming of age, a heightening of standards, a formulation of objectives. Beyond any question or doubt, the Association has been the greatest single force in the improvement of professional relationships between the colleges and the press."

"Unfortunately," commented Fine, across whose desk some 600 or 700 releases flowed each week, "the picture is not altogether a roseate one. Many directors have still to distinguish between sound educational stories and insignificant, unimportant items . . . [but] all things considered, the American College Publicity Association deserves all the praise in the world for the job it is doing. From difficult, painful beginnings, the Association has grown and developed. . . . It has taken a calling that bordered on the shady side, that brought sneers or worse to the lips of newspapermen, and has made it into a profession that today commands the respect and attention of both the educational and journalistic fraternity. . . . Instead of giving citations, I feel you should receive one and it might read like this:

> To the American College Publicity Association—for distinguished service in the field of higher education—for unstinting cooperation with the press—for an appreciation and understanding of newspaper problems—for constantly striving to elevate the standards of college news—for deep and serious consideration of the needs of reporters—for a growing awareness of serious campus trends and developments—for your role as adult educators in these perilous days—for your raising of a routine trade to the status of a respected profession—for all of these, and many more, the reporters and editors of the American press present you with a distinguished badge of merit, an award of honor.[52]

Dwight Marvin, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, also wrote in the *Digest:* "So twenty-five years have passed since the American College Publicity Association was founded. Slowly the little group who established it have proved the value of their calling and the worth of various methods by which ideas may be exchanged. . . . As one close to four colleges and two preparatory schools, I can testify to the value of trained publicity men in this field and the certainty of extension for their occupation. . . . On the whole you have done a notable job. As a working newspaperman, I touch my hat to you all."[53]

Only one college president appeared among the *Digest's* authors in 1941-42. His brief article was entitled "Making Public Relations Function."

"Today the very life and certainly the effectiveness of a college or university depend upon its public relations program," wrote Raymond W. Fairchild of Illinois State Normal University. "I do not mean its publicity program. There is a difference between publicity and public relations. Contacts, both good and bad, come in the class of public relations; and good personal relations are good public relations.

"Publicity has its roots in the obtaining of impressions. In public relations publicity serves as but one factor—and is often misused. For observations do not always coincide with publicity. . . . A knowledge of those served, a survey of facilities available, and a check as to effectiveness comprise the necessary bases of good public relations programs. . . . To be effective, public relations programs must take into account the entire school, must cover the whole scene.

"The maintenance of a good program demands the stressing of the service angle, both by and to the school; the upholding of standards or an avoidance of corner-cutting; off-campus visitations by staff members; the sponsorship of conferences on campus; attendance at conventions; and the obtaining and use of public reactions to the program."[54]

Starting in December, increasing emphasis was placed on the upcoming Silver Anniversary convention. The planners hoped for record registration to consider the problems, many of them new and sometimes confusing, facing ACPA members.

"Recognizing that colleges and their publicity directors are facing many new problems in wartimes," Convention Secretary Harold Schellenger said in his first article concerning the convention, "planners have determined that the program must be kept elastic, with ample time for consideration of special problems arising before, and even during, the meetings." He also announced that the convention would be preceded on May 4-6 by the annual Institute for Education by Radio in which many ACPA members were interested.

Although the convention would celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Association's founding, the general theme would be "Colleges in the War." "Work-study groups" were scheduled to take one afternoon and involve simultaneous sessions for Methodist colleges, Catholic colleges, small colleges, and large universities. Men would spend one afternoon discussing sports while women members had their own discussion group. The anniversary celebration would take place at the annual convention dinner.[55] At that time the delegates would hear addresses by the Association's first two presidents, T. T. Frankenberg and Bristow Adams, and would sing the convention song, "Rolling Through the Years," written by Dana Kelly, director of publicity at Ohio University:

From Maine to California,
The campus bells will ring;
And for our anniversary
A song of cheer we'll sing;
A quarter of a century,
We've served from day to day,
And from 'Seventeen to 'Forty-two,
We've come a long, long way.

Chorus

We'll seek the sunny rays,
And dream of college days,
We'll hope for brighter times ahead;
We've passed the toughest part,
And now we're set to start
On making college dreams come true;
We'll work for fellowship
And foster scholarship,
We'll keep our ideals flying high;
We're always serving education,
To help build a mighty nation,
As we keep on rolling through the years.[56]

When the convention opened on May 9, 154 representatives of colleges and universities in thirty states were on hand. Six of the fifteen addresses delivered related to the general theme, "Colleges in the War." Problems related to the war also received attention during the work-study sessions, the divisional meetings, and the panel discussions.[57]

"These are the days in which every activity can be measured by just one criterion: 'Does it contribute to winning the war?' " Henry T. Heald, president of Illinois Institute of Technology, said in addressing the first general session. "What can colleges do to help win the war? Is it necessary that the normal pattern of higher education be completely abandoned and replaced with a series of vocational courses? I think it is obvious that this is not the case. What we do need is a careful evaluation of our present objectives in terms of present and future needs, and perhaps some shift in emphasis to those things which are most important in the present emergency. Some of these things already exist in every college program. . . .

"I am glad that there is an organization such as the American College Publicity Association. Brought into being during the last war—on the very day that President Wilson asked Congress to declare war—it is destiny that your organization has grown and prospered to the point that now in this war, you are in a position to play an important role for education and for America. It is well that you are 'United in the Service of Education'; it is well that you are 'Interpreters of Education', for if education is to do its part in helping to win a world war, it needs interpretation. . . . You must eradicate the present confusion [about the colleges and the war], and inform the public on the proper function of the colleges during the war."[58]

Erwin D. Canham, managing editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, was present to accept the honorary membership in ACPA voted to him the year before. He spoke in a similar vein when he addressed the luncheon session which concluded the convention.

"We are in total war," he said, "and you are the ones who let the nation know what the campus is doing about it. Thus you are vital, for unless you do your job well, the nation will think the colleges are not doing their part and you will not be given priorities, you will not be certified as an essential industry, and you will not survive.

"Such misunderstanding of the college's role would, of course, be disastrous. As a trustee of a small college in Maine, I am particularly conscious of this threat, and I am convinced the colleges and universities will survive only as we give, only as we establish the nexus with the community. Our wartime and postwar roles are equally vital. Without wasting a moment from the all-embracing war effort, it is important to remember the need for education in the postwar world."[59]

"The college advertises itself even when it has no publicity director," Timothy Lehamnn, president of Elmhurst College, asserted in speaking on "What Does a College Expect of Its Publicity Director?" "Over against that," he said, "I maintain quite emphatically that when it does have a publicity director, he must not only be well-trained in matters of publicity, its principles and techniques, but he must also thoroughly understand the college he represents and the objectives of its publicity program. . . . There can be no doubt that a publicity director who runs contrary to the publicly-announced and traditionally-established objectives of a college is not only of no use but actually a detriment. . . . Yet a wisely-directed and thoroughly-defined program of publicity may win over friends and foes to a hearty support of an institution which stands for something."[60]

"What We Want To Know About the Colleges" was the subject of one of the panels on the convention's final day. Mrs. George A. Arnold of the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers summarized the answer when she said:

"We want to know that your faculty, your policies, your programs, your purpose, your equipment are able to send forth men and women who will not only know how to make a living, but will know how to spend that living and will know how to spend *themselves*—in self-development and service."[61]

Work of the Committee on Cooperation With National Defense and of the Committee on Educational Service during 1941-42 was detailed earlier in this chapter. Reports of the Committees on Resolutions, Awards, and Nominations, along with those of lesser committees, and the Association officers were also heard during the convention business session.

The delegates adopted the following resolutions suggested by the committee headed by John DeCamp: That the Association pledge "its full cooperation, loyalty, and support to the President of the United States and to the agencies prosecuting the war"; that the Association's officers make an all-out effort to gear the organization's program completely to the war effort; that for the duration of the war all members of the Association serving with the armed forces be retained as personal members without payment of dues; that the Association urge the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives to study carefully the possible future implications of a current proposal to limit further the amount of tax exemption permitted on gifts to colleges and charitable institutions; and that the Association wholeheartedly endorse a proposal that the Ways and Means Committee support some income tax exemptions for parents with children between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one attending college.

"The Association," DeCamp's committee wrote, "endorses this proposal in that it will furnish to parents a needed relief in taxes at a time when the expenses of these youth are the greatest to their parents and in that it will also serve as an encouragement to secure a higher education and thereby will broaden the vision and understanding of these young people and make them better able to assume future places of responsibility as guardians of the American way of life."

Again, in another resolution, the Association condemned "blatant misrepresentation of campus life" by certain publications, both by pictures and by text. In still another resolution, it authorized its president to appoint a standing Committee on Ethics which would consider any infraction of the Code of Ethics adopted the previous year, then recommend suitable action to the Executive Committee.[62] There is no record that the resolution was ever implemented.

ACPA's awards for distinguished service and unselfish devotion to the Association over a long period of years were conferred upon Eleanor Mosely of Boston Universtiy and W. Emerson Reck of Colgate Universtiy, both of them past presidents and long-time contributors to the Association in numerous capacities. Two other past presidents, DeCamp and Edmund S. Carpenter of Marquette University, also received Association awards, the former for special achievement in the field of educational publicity and the latter for similar achievement in the field of sports promotion.

Watson Davis, director of Science Service, was awarded the ACPA citation for distinguished service in the interpretation of higher education and Wilson L. Fairbanks, telegraph news editor and former education editor of the New York *Times*, received an honorary membership in recognition of "his work in pioneering the field of education in the public press."

Unanimously elected upon the recommendation of the Committee on Nominations and Place headed by Eleanor Mosely were the following officers for 1942-43: President, Harold Ellis, University of California; secretary-treasurer, Edward D. Whittlesey, Western Reserve; vice presidents, Arthur L. Brandon, University of Texas, membership; Harold K. Schellenger, Ohio State University, regions; Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma, research; Elmer G. Sulzer, University of Kentucky, radio; Mrs. Elliot Gardner, Sarah Lawrence College, women's activities; and Max E. Hannum, Carnegie Institute of Technology, athletics; editor, Francis C. Pray, Massachusetts State College; associate editor, Kingsley W. Given, Park College; and business manager, Roy K. Wilson, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College.

In view of unsettled conditions, Miss Mosely's committee passed along to the Executive Committee the three invitations received for the 1943 convention. The invitation of the U.S. Military Academy was tentatively accepted, and Lieutenant Colonel Meade Wildrick, West Point's publicity director, was named convention secretary.

Pioneering in a new office, Hugh Fogarty, vice president for radio, made ten recommendations in his report to the convention. His suggestions included the preparation of a manual for college broadcasters; adoption of an exchange system through which members would trade radio scripts and transcriptions; close cooperation by ACPA with the Institute for Education by Radio, the Association for Education by Radio, and the National Association of Educational Broadcasters; greater use of radio to tell the public about the contributions of colleges to the total war effort; and efforts to persuade the networks to intensify their coverage of the serious, academic side of college life.

Harold Ellis reported that a new record of activity for the broadened regional organization had been set during 1941-42. Fourteen of the fifteen districts had held meetings varying in length from an evening session to three days. With the annual dues doubled from $5 to $10, and with many directors leaving the campus for war service, memberships, Arthur L. Brandon reported, had dropped to 409 from 554 the year before. An even greater drop had been anticipated, but a committee of forty-three persons using personal letters and a printed circular had cut the loss. Despite the decline in membership, Secretaty-Treasurer Whittlesey was able to report that, financially, 1941-42 had been the best year in the Association's history. Total assets of the organization, he announced, stood at $2,818, campared to $1,741 at the end of the 1940-41 fiscal year.[63]

Frankenberg was the center of attraction at the convention dinner, first as he addressed the delegates in the speech, "We Look Before and After," then as he was accorded special honors.

"Today the world takes publicity for granted. Twenty-five years ago," he said, "publicity men were asked to appear before clubs and to explain just what they did and why. . . . When ACPA was coming into being neither movies nor radio were feasible as promotional elements. . . year after year the newspapers were becoming more popular. The newspapers spoke in the vernacular. The colleges did not. The colleges were aloof. Above everything they wanted to be dignified or at least to be thought dignified. The press was curious and wanted to be informed in the language of the common people. The situation called for a mediator. Enter the publicity man. The college publicity man was lonesome, he wanted company. So ACPA came into being. It was as simple as that. . . . But for this particular group gathered here for a silver celebration, I do indeed cherish definite ambitions. The first of these is that it should be recognized for what it is: the highest and best authority and only American group of professional workers in the publicity field.

"We should practice what we preach. We should so advance the merits of membership that no worthwhile college or university in America could afford not to be represented. Next, we should have a permanent home and an expanded income and with these a program looking ahead for at least a decade. These imply a secretariat, an endowment, and more complete and extensive records than at present, with resources that would permit research and the compilation of case records. . . .

"Publicity will be important to American schools very largely because this is a democracy, and publicity is the sure means of conserving the democracy of an institution. It will be increasingly important because, if these schools are to achieve their maximum possibilities, they must be kept close to the people. In order that this may be true, the people must know about them. This is the heritage of service to which you are called. Do not underestimate it."[64]

Frankenberg, following his address, was twice honored by ACPA. First, President Ridings conferred upon him an honorary life membership, the first such honor conferred by the Association upon one of its own members.

"One of Mr. Frankenberg's hobbies is carrying a cane," Ridings continued. "He has for years seldom been seen without one. Because that seems to be such a typical and intimate part of him, the . . . Association thought fit to give him this cane . . . which has a silver handle in token of the Silver Anniversary of ACPA"[65]

"I practiced the gentle art [of carrying a cane] long before I was a publicity man," Frankenberg said in expressing his appreciation. "Nothing which this Association could do in the way of remembrance would I be so sure to cherish and so inevitably use."[66]

Presenting his own address to the convention, Ridings spoke on "The Challenge to ACPA."

"The first twenty-five years of ACPA have seen much of the accent put on physical growth," he said, "but now that something approaching maturity has been reached, ACPA is ready and eager for a spiritual growth during its second twenty-five years. I believe that ACPA is about ready for definite professional standards of membership. With this will come an obligation to provide instruction and training for capable young men and women who desire to enter the profession. For instance, we might sponsor the establishment of a course of study . . . designed to train for college publicity work. ACPA might publish specialized handbooks or manuals which would make available to beginners—interns, if you please—the accumulated experience of successful professionals in the field.

"As we meet here to celebrate our Silver Anniversary, we have reached the point where we dare to dream dreams—great dreams," Ridings concluded." ACPA dreams of becoming an organization of college publicity directors who will bear the unmistakable stamp of professional ability. ACPA dreams of an Association periodical outstanding in the field of publicity. ACPA dreams of a central national office where affairs of the Association may be efficiently handled and where persistent and intelligently directed efforts may be put into the business of making these dreams come true.

"ACPA, in its second twenty-five years, can realize just as many of these dreams as you, the individual member, permit it to realize. The pioneers have pointed the way, blazed the trail, carried the load. The Association has been nursed to maturity by a volunteer few who caught a vision and worked hard to translate that vision into a reality.

"ACPA can continue . . . along this pattern of its past. But real greatness can come to this Association only when a majority of its membership develops the fire and enthusiasm of those who combined to bring it through its first quarter century to this place where the vista of real opportunity for service is spread before it."[67]

So spoke the man who had seen some of his largest dreams for ACPA's Silver Anniversary year dashed by the war. But in his personal life he was, by a blend of desire, determination, enthusiasm, hard work, and the use of talents possessed by few individuals, realizing grand dreams which would be an inspiration to thousands.

Ridings, now just short of forty-seven, had been a member of ACPA only nine years. He was thirty-one when graduated from the University of Missouri and thirty-three when he received a Master of Arts degree in journalism, one of the first ever conferred. He had been a college dropout as a sophomore in 1914. But nearly a decade later, after employment as a union linotype operator with a publishing company and correspondent for St. Louis and Kansas City newspapers, he determined to return to college and devote the rest of his life to journalism education.

Ridings was also an accomplished pianist who had played professionally. Moreover, he had learned some time earlier that he had a talent for turning a word, phrase, or idea into a joke for which publishers gladly paid. He now used these talents to help support his family of four while he worked toward his Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees.

In addition to selling jokes, he also played the piano in the pit orchestra in one of the silent movie theaters in Columbia, Missouri. At he same time he served as Columbia correspondent for the Kansas City *Star* and taught in Missouri's School of Journalism with the rank of instructor.[68]

One year after receiving his bachelor's degree, while he was still working toward his master's, he was chosen by Texas Christian University (TCU) to found both its journalism and publicity departments. There he soon gained—and enjoyed—the reputation of being the "toughest prof" on campus. As the years passed, he enjoyed even more the reputation he gained "for placing in journalism every one of his students who wanted a job in that field."

"The loyalty, as well as the records of his students who 'survived' to a degree in journalism attest to the success of his methods," the editor of TCU's student newspaper once wrote.[69] At the same time the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* described him as "a teacher of rare gifts, inspiring the work of his students to the highest levels."[70]

As a publicist, Ridings, in the words of the Fort Worth *Press*, wrote "millions of words about TCU which have been printed all over the nation."[71] The humblest of men, Ridings always shunned publicity for himself, but his dreams of making TCU's journalism and publicity departments rank with the best brought him recognition nevertheless.[72]

Supporting The War Effort

More than most organizations, ACPA felt the full impact of the war during the year 1942-43. Often the Association and its members faced problems for which they had no answers and for which in some cases they could see none initially.

As President Ellis wrote in his reminiscences a decade later, "Our members did not wait to be called through selective service; they volunteered in the various branches of the armed forces, leaving vacancies that were difficult and in some cases impossible to fill. With big gaps torn in our organization, the war brought added work and the time left for other activities was of necessity curtailed.

"It was heartening to see how those upon whom the burden of the Association rested that year responded. They gave their time without stint; they worked hard, faithfully, and well. Without the assistance of such a staff, the president—too far away from the center of activities—would have been helpless; the year never could have approached success. As it was, the program that had been envisioned had to be stripped to essentials."[73]

Endowed with optimism, enthusiasm, and a keen sense of humor as well as outstanding administrative ability, Ellis was the ideal man for the presidency at this stage in Association history. At fifty-eight he was the oldest man ever elected to the Association's top office. However, his close-cropped hair, dapper figure, well-tailored suits (usually gray), bow ties, and battered old pipe, all badges of respectability in the 1940s, made him seem much younger and instantly acceptable to Association members half his age.

"I think that Harold's ability to make friends, and his ability to put the most serious business on a personal and usually humorous level, enabled him to get cooperation where it otherwise would never have been obtained," George Pettit, one of Ellis' first assistants and later his successor, declared following his boss' retirement in 1950.

Ellis had no thought of becoming a publicity man when he entered Whitman College in 1903. It was the ministry which called him. But when he preached his first sermon as a junior the experience led him to switch to philosophy. After graduation, he worked for eighteen years on the editorial staff of leading west coast newspapers before California's President Robert G. Sproul tapped him for the Berkeley campus publicity job in 1925. Initially it was a one-man operation with a budget that covered little more than postage stamps. However, by the time Ellis retired twenty-five years later, he had built the office into a state-wide operation covering all of California's public university campuses.[74]

As the fiscal year started on September 1, Ellis' administration found itself charged with the last two issues of the Association monthly, *College Publicity Digest*, which had been printed too late to get into the 1941-42 budget. Nevertheless, the Executive Committee decided to change the name of the publication to *Publicity Problems*, increase its size, enlarge its format to 8½×11, and make greater use of color. Editor Fran Pray also enlivened the magazine by using "action" pictures on the front cover each month, a practice followed by editors thereafter. In changing the name of the magazine to *Publicity Problems*, the officers decided that the annual convention report would be published under the title of *Publicity Digest*.[75]

As early as September, Secretary Whittlesey reported that the Association's Placement Service "had several jobs available but no suitable candidates." Increasingly, as veteran members of the Association assumed positions with government agencies or joined the armed forces, men and women with minimal background for their work took over publicity duties in colleges and universities. Publication of more articles on the basics of publicity consequently became important and filled the pages of *Publicity Problems*.

"During months like these," Editor Pray said in his first issue of the magazine, "strong organizations will grow stronger; weak organizations may vanish. In authorizing a new and larger format for *Publicity Problems*, the officers of ACPA are predicating their decision upon their confidence that ACPA will perform an even more important service in pace with the growing responsibilities of its members."[76]

Starting with the December issue of *Publicity Problems* the staff was enlarged to include three additional assistant editors—Elmer G. Sulzer of the University of Kentucky, for radio; Sister M. Thaddeus of Seton Hill College, for news pictures, and Walter Paulison of Northwestern University, for sports. Thus the editorial staff included six persons, Kingsley Given of Park College and Clemewell Lay of Wellesley having been named associate editor and assistant editor for women's interests, respectively, at Columbus.[77]

Designed especially to be of help to the younger, less experienced members of the Association was the work of two columnists without editorial title, Paul O. Ridings and Stewart Harral. Ridings, son of ACPA's immediate past president and now director of the news bureau at Illinois Institute of Technology, began in November to contribute a monthly page of "Hot Tips" gathered with the help of Association members. Beginning with the December issue, Harral, vice president for research, resumed his "Headlines and Footnotes," which had been a popular feature of the magazine from 1938 to 1940.

The magazine suffered a setback when its business manager, Roy Wilson, joined the

Navy in November. After two months a replacement was found in Anne Wilder of Mount Holyoke College. Although she started too late to bring in maximum revenue for the year, Miss Wilder, by dint of hard work, saved the Association from heavy financial loss.[78]

Ellis went even further than his predecessors in trying to keep the membership informed about Association activities, efforts, and problems. He not only reported each month himself, under the heading "Straight From Headquarters," but urged his fellow officers to make brief reports with him, an invitation most of them accepted several times during the year. In his first report, Ellis urged members not to lose sight of the ideals and objectives of higher education while rendering the greatest possible service to the war effort.

"The world upheaval has reached us and our organization just as definitely as it has reached others in other walks of life, and in other organizations," he wrote. "Many of our men have been taken for war work, many have been drafted for activities in connection with the war; not one but has had to undertake new duties and added responsibilities.

"Registration in institutions of higher education has dropped sharply. Where enrollment is tied definitely to the welfare of the college or university, the publicity director must undertake new and more intensive student promotion campaigns. Where the war has speeded programs and given year-round operation, the publicity office again has an added load. With the taking over of institutional facilities and faculty members, where war work of any kind has been installed, still further work is entailed.

"I have no fear but that the members of the American College Publicity Association can and will do the job. I have greater fear that in our enthusiasm and zeal to render as great service as we can for the war effort, we may lose sight, temporarily at least, of the job we have been doing, and the one we will always have to do. By this I do not mean that we should not do everything in our power to aid the government in the present emergency; I want only to warn that the ideals and objectives of higher education must not be neglected or lost sight of while we are bending our energies toward victory in the war."[79]

Achievement of Association objectives, especially in the areas of membership, district activities, and the national convention posed new and difficult problems for the officers in 1942-43. In the area of membership the Association had lost heavily to the armed forces and many institutions were chary of spending money for replacements. By January, 1943, forty-three members had left their jobs to join the armed forces. Fifteen others, eight men and seven women, had forsaken publicity duties for work in defense activities.[80]

A committee composed of one representative from each state worked diligently under Vice President Arthur Brandon, using a modest promotion booklet titled *Now It Must Be Told* and sample copies of *Publicity Problems*. Emphasis was also given to a new policy adopted at the Columbus convention, permitting all additional members of an enrolled institution's staff, to affiliate with the Association for $5, half the regular fee. Although fifty-eight new members joined, total membership dropped to 368 from the preceding year's total of 409.

Only six of the Association's fifteen districts reported meetings, although two others in the East ultimately held business sessions in conjunction with the national convention. Most of the districts which failed to hold meetings had lost their directors to the armed forces.[81]

As early as September, 1942, some doubt was expressed about the 1943 convention scheduled to be held at the U. S. Military Academy in April. In December Ellis announced that the academy had withdrawn its invitation because the hotel at West Point was being converted into barracks to house cadets being trained in the academy's expanded program.[82] There was no place in the district where the convention could be held except in New York City, and none of the colleges or universities there was willing to undertake handling a convention.

Because of national restrictions on travel, other conventions scheduled in New York were being cancelled. However, after some negotiation ACPA was given permission to proceed with plans. Floyd Tifft of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, former *Digest* editor, was then persuaded by Ellis to accept the job of convention secretary, line up the program from his own office in Troy, New York, then travel 150 miles or so down to the metropolis to arrange details.[83]

In March, Tifft announced that the convention had been postponed to May 6-8 as a result of advice that "the travel situation would probably be easier at that time because of the lifting by then of wintertime pressures from the railroads." The program, he added, was being keyed to the wartime effort to the greatest possible degree.[84]

In April, Ellis told the membership through *Publicity Problems* that the convention would "be devoid of frills and foibles; it will be devoted to business not entertainment." In the same issue Tifft reemphasized that the convention would be devoted largely to immediate war needs.

"It will also attempt to anticipate or recognize and discuss challenging influences which will grow out of the war and with which higher education will surely have to deal in the postwar world," he added. Tifft also said that more time than usual would be allotted for discussion—that the number of speakers and subjects "will be limited to permit time to thresh matters out and obtain the benefits of each other's experience."[85]

Some colleges were reducing their publicity staffs and others were finding it difficult to replace veteran publicists going off to war. Nevertheless, the feeling was growing that the responsibilities of men and women of broad background and sound judgment would be increasingly large, especially when the war was over.

"Faced with numerous vital problems, notably declining enrollments, presidents and other administrators are beginning to realize the value and potentialities of public relations," Stewart Harral said in "A Portrait of a Year—1942," a report on a survey he had made on current and anticipated educational problems. "Twenty-nine publicists," he continued, "agreed that their bosses have shown a tremendous interest in public relations since wartime problems have increased. Thirty-one noted that their administrators had shown some new interest in public relations procedures. Only two reported that their administrative officials had not changed their attitudes toward good will-building measures."[86]

The job ahead for ACPA members was spelled out in an earlier article written for the Association magazine by Louis M. Lyons, long-time newspaperman and curator of Nieman Fellowships at Harvard University.

"I am convinced that public relations in education is still in the germ stage, and that it is certain to emerge in a more highly developed form with a much larger role in education in the postwar period," Lyons wrote.

Lyons declared that the main problem, as he saw it, "is one of bringing college publicity to the level of information service in the intellectual fields that truly represent the college; and in bringing to the job a man qualified for it and with a status that permits him to be effective.

". . . The public that supports the institution, actively or passively—by endowment, by taxation, or at least by tolerating tax exemption and other privileges—needs to be informed of the larger pattern of developments, of the major steps of scientific progress, of key issues of policy, of the response to public needs in research and expansion of knowledge. The institution requires that a sound basic knowledge of its work, its needs, its aspirations and efforts, its place in society, be interpreted to those whose support or good will its future must have and whose understanding it would seek to advance."

Lyons also anticipated greatly increased prestige and status for the public relations man able to carry the responsibilities visualized.

"He must be a major executive of the institution, of the grade of vice president or at least assistant to the president and high in the councils of the administrative officers," Lyons asserted. "Such an executive obviously needs more than a flare for press agentry. He must have an intellectual capacity that makes him at home in the university, an intellectual curiosity that leads him to ceaseless exploration of the educational resources of the institution, and a proselytizing zeal to extend the benefits and uses of knowledge through all the agencies of publicity. I am not sure that he needs to be a newspaperman. But he must be a man of extensive experience in public relations of one sort or another. . . .

"Such a man needs to be one of sound intellectual equipment so that he will not permit the university to be represented by trivialities. It is superfluous to note that not many men now engaged in college publicity are equipped for this larger role. And it would not be fruitful for the man of large-gauge capacities to undertake such a task until the administration is ready for it. Such a development must start with the president. Until a president with a creative attitude toward public relations is in command, a really first-rate mind would probably be wasted in the publicity office. . . . Any president who desires that his university shall serve a larger usefulness in the community should see to it as one of the bases of policy that a really first-rate mind fills the public relations chair, and that he be given a key place in the administration."[87]

The need for concentrating attention on the broader aspects of public relations was emphasized yet again in *Publicity Problems* when Harold Schellenger wrote on "Public Relations—Here to Stay." Addressing himself directly to college presidents, Schellenger said: "You *can't* get along without public relations. They are as inevitable as the proverbial death and taxes. As long as you and your institution exist, you will have public relations. It's just a matter of *what kind* of public relations your university enjoys—good, bad, or indifferent. . . .

"After all, Mr. President, public relations is a term almost synonymous with *human* relations, and so long as you are dealing with people and are dependent upon them for your patronage and support they certainly will have *some kind* of opinion of your college or university!"

Schellenger decried the fact that few university administrators had as yet gained "a full and proper understanding of what public relations really entails." "Although it would seem that public opinion of higher education and of institutions individually should be a matter of serious concern, the subject very seldom is discussed at meetings of educational administrators," he wrote.

"Many an educational administrator who is hypercritical of the service he gets in stores, who expects courtesy in all his off-campus relationships, who demands prompt and responsive replies to his letters, is today tolerating just the opposite on his own campus," Schellenger continued. "He needs to place himself occasionally in the place of his students, their parents, and other patrons of the institution to understand the true significance of public relations.

"In all . . . public relations activities the president bears a major responsibility. More than he realizes, the institution bears his imprint. . . . He may have a public relations director on his staff, but that director will have no great success if the president doesn't accept personal leadership of the public relations program, by precept and example. There are too many institutions in which the major job of the public relations director or the director of publicity is to make the administration appear to be a friendly, public-minded one when in reality it is no such thing!

"Some day some university president will set up a thoroughgoing public relations program and see that it is carried out to the smallest detail. When that messiah comes along, he will not only put his own institution on the map—he will help to answer many of the criticisms now heaped upon higher education generally, and he will point the way to a new and happier relationship between the universities and the publics from which they stem."[88]

Several innovations especially apropos the times were introduced to readers of *Publicity Problems* by Editor Pray. One of these was a series of nine "How We Do It" articles in which a different author each month told how the publicity job was handled at his institution. In January, February, and March, Pray featured another series of articles, this one called "How to Pick Publicity Assistants," written by Walter F. Dantzscher of Pennsylvania State College.

In May, Pray gave his readers the initial installment of a two-part article written by Earl Schenck Miers, manager of the Rutgers University Press. The article guided the reader step by step through the production of the college catalog with thorough and lucid coverage of such facets as type, design, paper, and margins.

Through the efforts of Elmer Sulzer, ACPA's vice president for radio, and with the cooperation of his institution, the University of Kentucky, a series of ten programs dealing with venereal disease was produced for commercial radio stations. Trailblazing programs, they were for nearly a year turned down by all Kentucky stations for fear of the reaction by listeners, by the National Association of Broadcasters, and by the Federal Communications Commission. Station KOAC at Oregon State Agricultural College became the first station to use the series and won a Peabody Radio Award as a result. The story was told by Sulzer in "U. K. Breaks Radio's 'V. D'. Taboo," last of five articles on possibilities for publicity through radio, published in *Publicity Problems*.[89]

To point up some of the shortcomings of publicity copy being provided to newspapers by inexperienced college publicists, Pray had Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York *Times*, write an article called "Horrible Examples."

"While I have great respect for the publicity profession generally," Fine said, "far too many releases reach me that belong in the wastebasket. They are trivial in content, awkward in expression, amateurish in design." He then drove his criticisms home by drawing on examples from some of the hundreds of stories which arrived on his desk in a single week.[90]

To give the inexperienced in the Association further help, an article on "Ten Rules for Good Style" by Harvey J. Owens of Lakeside Press was carried in *Publicity Problems*. To emphasize the importance of the rules he was presenting, Owens quoted W. E. Woodward in his first paragraph: "In writing my books I work a long time on the first page, the first chapter, and even the first sentence, for I want to say something right off the bat that will catch and hold the reader's attention."[91]

Although almost every member was carrying a heavier work load, budgets were tight, and travel difficult, the convention held in New York City May 6-8 was attended by approximately 150.

The theme of the convention was "The Immediate Emergency and the Postwar World." The program was devoted largely to seven discussion sessions on wartime publicity activities as they related to education news, radio, features and pictures, physical education, fund raising, press wire services, and magazines. Thirty-four men and women with expertise in their fields were discussion participants.

In delivering the keynote address, Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University, prophesied with insight:

"Any regional plan [for the future] must ultimately fit into a world plan," he said. "In particular, two great nations with which we must learn to live will have emerged as a result of this war. These nations are China and Russia. The great national impulses which have unified them in these tragic years will not end with the war. Any plans for a stable peace must take into account their membership in the family of nations, as it must take into account the new sense of common purpose among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. . . . I do not believe that we shall once more make the mistake we made twenty-five years ago. But unless public opinion is aroused and informed it could be made, and you can make it your responsibility to arouse and to inform. . . .

"We must also begin now to reshape our whole educational system so that the nation will not only prepare its sons and daughters for a richer life but help our less fortunate neighbors toward understanding and freedom."[92]

Television as a medium of publicity and public relations received attention during a discussion of possibilities through radio. Participating in that discussion, Norman D. Waters, president of the American Television Society, revealed that television had been set for rapid development before wartime regulations had reduced from fifteen to four the number of hours stations could be on the air. Educational possibilities for television after the war would be unlimited, he predicted, with important sections of the country linked by networks capable of providing programs with sound, motion, and color.[93]

Many of the nation's colleges were running deficits as a result of decreasing enrollments brought on by concentration on the war effort. "The plight of the colleges" was the theme for many articles in newspapers and magazines, and predictions that conditions would bring about the closing of many institutions were common. One prominent writer went so far as to predict that 600 colleges would close.[94]

One of the messages presented to the New York conferees, all of whom were facing stringent financial action back on their campuses, was therefore especially comforting for its optimistic viewpoint. It was presented by George Lundy of Marts and Lundy, the New York fund-raising firm which had been helpful to ACPA on several previous occasions and shortly would help the Association produce a much-needed manual on publicity procedures.

"The difficulty with the trustees of the colleges referred to and with those who have been predicting such a dark future . . . is three-fold," he said. "First, they underestimate the vitality of our educational institutions of higher learning; second, they do not appreciate the loyalty of many thousands of citizens who have supported these institutions so generously in the past, and third, they do not understand the effect of war upon the giving propensities of our people."

Lundy then quoted from observations and studies which indicated that war, instead of curtailing giving to religious and educational institutions, greatly stimulates it. He pointed out, for instance, that receipts of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions during the Civil War increased more that fifty percent. He also quoted from American church leaders and from *The New Statesman and Nation*, a British magazine, to show how giving both in the United States and in England had "increased tremendously" since the outbreak of World War II. Lastly a study covering the twenty-year period ending in 1928 showed that giving had more than doubled during World War I.

"Tax rates increased rapidly beginning with 1914, just as they are doing now," Lundy said. "But as tax rates were raised and the amount of taxes paid by citizens materially increased, the amounts given to philanthropic institutions also greatly increased. During the five years of 1912 to 1916, inclusive, the average amount given to philanthropic causes was $593,200,000 per year. During the next three years of 1917-1919, the average was $1,045,666,000, or nearly double the average of the previous five years."

Lundy indicated two reasons for increased giving in wartime: "The people have more money" and "The emergency through which the nation is passing . . . inspires a greater spirit of sacrifice." On the basis of studies on giving related to America's major wars since the 1860s, Lundy drew two conclusions of special interest to colleges and their publicity directors: "that educational institutions can and should strengthen their financial structures now to be prepared properly to function in fulfilling the great responsibility which will be theirs in the years of peace," and "that . . . a well-managed educational institution need have no hesitancy in approaching its constituency in a properly organized fund-raising program for an amount which can be clearly demonstrated as needed and which is within the capacity of that constituency to give."[95]

America's future rests on the effective use of the engineering of consent for sound democratic ends, Edward L. Bernays, the New York public relations counselor, told the delegates as he spoke before an ACPA convention for the fourth time since 1922.

To be in a position to engineer consent in a democracy, Bernays said, a public relations man must get the answers to a series of questions: "What is my objective or the objective of my client? What are the attitudes and actions desired? What symbols, words, pictures, and actions emphasize favorable attitudes, change indifferent attitudes, blanket negative attitudes? What are the most effective channels for reaching the public—radio, press, movies, or mail? What are the group formations of the public? Will the public think and act along lines of economic, religious, social, or other interests? How much in men, money, and materials will be required?

"We now decide whether the objectives are realistic or not," Bernays continued. "After clarifying our objectives, we develp our themes—the ideas that are to be projected to the public. . . . Strategy is the next consideration . . . it may be blitzkrieg or rearguard action; it may be frontal attack, or a combination of strategies.

"With our strategy outlined, we proceed to organization. . . . In your case, it means planning your time and effort and those of your staff to meet the problems. Tactics, the next step, evolve from previous determinations. Each element in our approach must be coordinated. . . . Every approach should form a part of the broad integrated program. . . . The social forces that mold American attitudes and actions—commerce and industry, labor, social services, religion, women's interests, youth, and other social groups—must be harnessed to your project. . . .

"The engineering of consent has served many groups and many purposes—statesmen, politicians, businessmen, professionals, labor," Bernays concluded. "They have clarified their objectives in their own minds. They have worked out their themes and strategy. They have developed timing, planning, and organization. It is important that all of us, particularly those of sound social purpose, apply the engineering approach. Through it we may work effectively for public support of democratic goals—the winning of the war and the peace to follow, opportunities in higher education, the maintenance and development of our way of life."[96]

The honorary membership previously voted to Wilson L. Fairbanks, telegraph news editor of the New York *Times*, was presented to the venerable newsman with an appropriate citation at the 1943 convention dinner. At the same time President Ellis presented five other citations as recommended by the Committee on Awards headed by Tremmie Eisley of Bucknell University.

Benjamin Fine received the nonmember citation for distinguished service in the interpretation of education, while past President Frank S. Wright of the University of Florida and Homer M. Dunham of Western Michigan State Teachers College, a veteran ACPA member who had served the organization in various capacities, received citations "for distinguished work in educational interpretation and promotion, for unselfish service to the Association, and for contributions to the development of publicity standards over a period of years."

Another past president, Earl Reed Silvers, who had gained wide publicity for Rutgers University during its 175th annversary year, received the Association's citation for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of education during the current year. Joseph Petritz, director of sports publicity at Notre Dame from 1927 until he entered the Navy earlier in 1943, received the award for outstanding achievement in sports publicty in the current year.[97]

One of the Association's most active committees during the year was that on war cooperation. The chairman, Donald K. Anderson of the University of Michigan, was able to report substantial progress to the convention delegates. The committee, Anderson said, had concentrated on efforts meant to facilitate cooperation between college publicity offices and Army and Navy bureaus of public relations in matters relating to current and anticipated training programs at collegiate institutions.

As a result of contacts made by Anderson, a public relations program involving the cooperation of college publicity offices and the Bureau of Public Relations of the War Department had been started. The corresponding bureau of the Navy had indicated its interest in utilizing ACPA to inform college publicity directors of the application of Navy regulations to its new college training units.

Anderson had also been invited by the Army to meet with representatives of the War Department's Bureau of Public Relations to help formulate a publicity program for the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP). Out of this meeting came the Army's decision to use existing publicity machinery on college campuses where ASTP units were established. A similar cooperative project was later developed with the Navy. Responding to a resolution offered at the convention, the delegates pledged themselves "to extend their services to the government in every capacity desirable to bring an early and victorious end to the war." Upon the recommendation of the Committee on Resolutions, the delegates also voted to give honorary status for the duration of the war to those members who had entered the armed forces.[98]

Efforts were continuing under Eleanor Mosely's leadership to achieve the goal of a central office, but educational organizations most interested in cooperation, she reported, still found financial as well as professional assistance impossible. To help relieve the increasing load of the secretary-treasurer, the Executive Committee had appropriated $500 for part-time clerical and secretarial help for that office. Whittlesey was able to report, however, that volunteer help had kept the expenditure to $57.40.[99]

Whittlesey, introduced by Miss Mosely, chairman of the Nominating Committee, as "a visionary whose horizons are reached by practical application," was named ACPA president for 1943-44, and E. Ross Bartley of Indiana University was elected secretary-treasurer. Other officers elected were: vice presidents, Arthur L. Brandon, University of Texas, research; Horace Renegar, Tulane University, membership; Charles E. Widmayer, Dartmouth College, regions; P. Caspar Harvey, William Jewell College, radio; Sister M. Thaddeus, Seton Hill College, women's activities, and Joseph Sherman, Clemson College, sports activities; Association editor, Kingsley W. Given, Western Reserve University; associate editor, Gertrude M. Hall, Illinois State Normal University, and business manager, Paul O. Ridings, Illinois Institute of Technology.[100]

Although the clouds of war hung darkly over the New York convention it was not without its lighter moments. Several of these came after Eleanor Mosely confided to a few friends that she was to be married in September to Edward R. Collier of the Boston University faculty.

"Knowing our crowd," ACPA's first woman president wrote some years later, "I thought it better not to advertise my marital plans, but I did want to share by happiness with some of my closest friends. So I made the error of confiding in Bob Madry, Horace Renegar, Harold Ellis, and their wives. Nothing would do but Edward must come down to New York right away. He was grading final examinations in Boston. Bob and Horace got on the phone, located Edward, and insisted that they had to meet him. At first he demurred, but Carolina, Louisiana, and California, among them, proved too strong for his better judgment. So down he came the next afternoon, just about the hottest day of the spring.

"Max Hannum [retiring vice president for sports activities] and Mrs. Hannum had issued invitations for one and all for cocktails in their suite. I waited for Edward, and of course we were the last to arrive, as he had to erase his travel stains and freshen up for the evening. As we opened the door at the Hannums' party, a welter of voices ground against our ears, gay and bright and laughing. We heard a voice shout: 'Here they are!' And then we heard a mighty roar as, with one voice, the entire crowd began to chant, 'Here comes the bride'. So much for men keeping secrets!"[101]

After their marriage, Collier accompanied his wife to most Association conventions. The genial professor, a courtly gentleman always, became a great favorite with the wives of delegates, who nicknamed him "ACPA Convention Husband."

Although three months remained in the fiscal year, Harold Ellis made the symbolic gesture of turning the president's mantle over to Ed Whittlesey before the convention's close. As he did so he presented the president-elect with a gavel which was to become a treasured artifact of the Association, particularly because of the history it allegedly possessed.

"In the days when Hawaii was ruled by the legendary chief, Kamehameka," Ellis told the delegates with a straight face, "he ruled the islands with an iron hand and a great war club which no other man was powerful enough to wield. After his death the great club was lost, until it was found by an islander who cut it up to make legs for a table. This table was used aboard a ship which plied between the islands and San Francisco, known as a laundry boat because it carried laundry from California to Hawaii to be done there. Of course it carried other cargo.

"On a return voyage from San Francisco the ship was wrecked as it neared Honolulu, and six men were enabled to make it to Honolulu by clinging to the table. The table was cast on the beach but a beach boy named Kane recognized it. Knowing the history of the war club and the table legs, he kept it in his beach cottage for years, but finally it was purchased from him at a fancy price by a skipper who was the son of the captain who lost the laundry boat. After Pearl Harbor, as he was sailing back from some Pacific Islands to Hawaii, his ship was shelled. Again the boat was sunk and again the table saved the lives of members of the crew.

"This time four men used it for a life preserver, but adverse currents and wind kept them from port for many days. Fish abounded but they had no way of catching them. Finally, they wrenched a leg from the table and killed fish with it, enabling them to subsist until they landed on the beach. Again the old beach boy regained his table, the one leg being lost. Wilkes [former University of California staffer stationed in Honolulu] was very friendly with the beach boy and finally persuaded him to give him a second leg, and aided him to nail the table by one side to the wall, the other side being supported by the two remaining legs. The leg Wilkes sent was backed by this rich tradition."

Not until nine years later, in response to an inquiry made by a skeptical president of the Association, did Ellis provide a more plausible background for the gavel:

"Some months before the [1943] convention Joe Wright wrote me and suggested that since two of the men from my office were in the Navy, and stationed at Honolulu, it would be a good idea for one of them to get hold of a piece of wood from one of the ships wrecked by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor.

"This it was found impossible to do, but Don Wilkes sent over the piece of Koa wood from which the gavel was made. I took it up to the branch of the College of Agriculture at Davis, where James F. Wilson, adept at wood carving, turned the gavel for me. This version I have never given to the members of the Association so they won't believe it."[102]

Despite unique problems faced by the Association in planning and holding its convention, the meeting was not only one of the largest yet held but was also the first on record to return a profit to the organization. After Convention Secretary Floyd Tifft had met all expenses, he forwarded a check for $406.10 to the treasurer.[103]

Public Relations Concept Grows

Rationing, price controls, withholding tax, invasion of Italy, D Day in Normandy, shortening of the battle lines to Tokyo, and reconversion captured major headlines in 1943-44. It was thoroughly a World War year with ACPA and its members increasingly involved.

It was a year marking the turning point in the "war of words" as well as that on the battlefield. Initially, the efforts of America to compete with the high-powered efficiency of the enemies' propaganda machine had somewhat resembled those of a peddler with a push cart. But psychological warfare had challenged the thinking of all involved, including that of ACPA members. Now the government's public relations and propaganda campaigns were bearing fruit on the home front, in the factories, and on the battle fronts. As these campaigns developed they also contributed materially to better understanding of public relations techniques as applied in higher education as well as in national defense.

The year 1943-44 was also that in which plans were made for the education of returning veterans as well as for the reconstruction of the business of the nation. Before plans for veterans could be crystallized, the nation had to decide whether returning GI's should be afforded the finest educational opportunities a grateful nation could offer, or whether the attitude of Robert Maynard Hutchins, University of Chicago president, should prevail—that education of veterans at government expense would be a threat to the entire college system and would likely "develop a generation of educational hobos."

The attitude of ACPA and its leadership was that, far from being a threat, returning veterans provided the nation with a challenge and "the greatest opportunity of our lifetime." The expressed attitude of the Association was: "We meet this challenge, or leave the veterans—our leaders for the next twenty to forty years—without the educational background to meet the international problems we must pass on to them."[104]

In 1943-44 the idea was solidly planted that America's colleges and universities were not only serving the war effort but also preparing to help build after the war a democracy stronger than any nation had ever seen.

Individually and collectively, members of ACPA were telling the people of the nation and of the world what was taking place on their campuses: the training of fighting men who would be able to cope with many times their number in battle on land, at sea, or in the air; research which was helping to give a fighting advantage to the men in uniform; instruction in civilian defense. Individually, ACPA members were engaged in a host of interpretative activities making known what the colleges were doing to help win the war, and what progress was being made in these efforts. Collectively, they were cooperating with governmental bodies, national associations, newspapers, magazines, and radio networks in various jobs of interpretation. Wherever the Association and its members could provide help in the struggle for victory, they were on the job.

The year of 1943-44 was one of reappraisal of the values of life and of education, of examining these to determine whether America's technology had exceeded its understanding of humanity. While members of ACPA were often worried about the shortage of newsprint and the resulting shortage of space for education news, they could be happy over the fact that, during this period, they had seen additional improvement in the attitude of newspaper editors toward college publicists and public relations officers. Editors, more heavily than ever before, were leaning on ACPA members for news. They consulted the Association and its members on drives, campaigns, and plans. It was a time of growing recognition for Association members and for education.

Resembling nothing so much as a general, dashing, sword in hand, from one part of the battlefield to another in an effort to encourage his men to greater action, was ACPA's president during this year. Six times during the year President Whittlesey used *Publicity Problems* to carry to the membership messages finely honed for the job of inspiring greater and broader effort. He sent or carried similar messages to those in attendance at district meetings. He kept in close touch with his officers to make sure they were doing well the jobs expected of them. He worked tirelessly for understanding of college problems by the government and for acceptance of opportunities for cooperation among colleges and educational associations. Once he responded to what he considered a slur against educational public relations people by requesting and getting equal space in a magazine widely circulated among educators.[105]

"It wasn't," said the editor of *College Publicity Digest* several years earlier, "the five cents an item which Edward Deming Whittlesey got for doing reportorial work for a Kansas weekly that made him resolve 'to seek his fortune' in this field; rather it was the fun he got out of his work."[106]

Whittlesey, who seemed to get maximum enjoyment out of any job he undertook, began his administration with not one but two articles in the first issue of *Publicity Problems* for 1943-44.

One of these articles, titled "At What Point Is Higher Education in Need of Militant Public Relations?" later appeared with some elaboration in *School and Society* as an answer to an article in that magazine which had deplored the state of higher education public relations vis-a-vis government and industry.

"Higher education," Whittlesey wrote, "is now in the midst of the most militant public relations program in its history, yet it is charged that the 'colleges and universities in the main have held themselves aloof from government and business'." The article then detailed how higher education was joining with government "to offer courses which would meet the needs of the wartime emergency and train personnel for both wartime and postwar service."

"College and university laboratories from coast to coast," Whittlesey added, "are beehives of research—research which is contributing enormously to the improvement of the equipment and materiel of our war machine. Simultaneously, these labs are discovering new conveniences, devices, and medicaments which will make jobs and supply new comforts to all of us in the postwar world. Their findings are military secrets, of course, but when the stories can be told they will thrill the world."

Whittlesey, who sensed that America's colleges would face the greatest challenges in their history after the fighting had ceased and the fighters were home again, took every opportunity to emphasize this conviction and urge advance preparation.

Although he believed that ACPA's most important goal for 1943-44 should be "an increase in services to our government to help hasten the day of united nations' victory," he also exhorted the 1943-44 membership to prepare for peacetime activities and: (1) appraise postwar problems and define objectives; (2) develop postwar projects; (3) lay foundations for service in postwar reconstruction, especially in the interpretation of higher education's role in the establishment of vital, lasting peace. Three other goals concerned activities with potential for increasing education's impact in the postwar period: (1) the strengthening of ties with policy-making groups in higher education; (2) development of cooperation with other groups engaged in educational interpretation and public relations; (3) cooperation with secondary education to help bring about harmony and efficiency of joint action.[107]

Concluding "ACPA—First Line of Offense in Postwar Education," the lead article in *Publicity Problems* for September, 1943, Whittlesey declared: "Americans who have felt the pulse of the heavens and all corners of the earth will return to their homeland with the biggest challenge to higher education that we have ever seen. This is the real story, the great interpretation job for us tomorrow. Now, as we await today's midnight communiqué, is the time to get ready."[108]

Whittlesey revealed himself as something of a political philosopher with an article, "This Is Our Wealth!" in a winter issue of *Publicity Problems*. It was his contention that everything in human relations remained to be done—or done over.

"Man," Whittlesey wrote, "has no satisfactory substitute, in the solution of his numerous, varied, and complex problems, for the thoughtful opinions of many of his fellows. Democracy is predicated upon freedom of choice. We may use or abuse our privilege of individual action. The sooner we learn to use this inexhaustible source of energy collectively the more rapidly we'll attain the goals of which we are capable.

"We must make popular the idea that work makes wealth, make unpopular the notion that the world owes us a living. We must build up the philosophy that security is earned, as each of us contributes his share to the world's wealth. . . . We must likewise destroy the vitality-sapping theory which proclaims that a nation can print old age prosperity on our high speed presses. . . .

"Either we toughen up in our thinking," Whittlesey continued, "or we can write this nation off as a world power in one more generation. The 'out-of-this-world' notion that Uncle Sam is a rich old sucker who can forever endorse blank checks for his darling nieces and nephews must be relegated to the mythology of the thirties. If we don't abandon it we are going to wake up some foggy morning to learn that our dear old rich uncle is dead. We shall be grieved, of course, until we are shocked by the news that 'he died bankrupt'. By this time the Lilliputians will have done their work and the giant of today will be the helpless stooge of tomorrow—easy prey for those nations who have spent the intervening years, because they had to, toughening up mentally and physically. . . .

"We have learned that our elders have *not* made a fit society," Whittlesey concluded. "And *we must* try. There's a job for us and our generation in the business of educational interpretation and in the tremendous business of helping men to live harmoniously together. It's a joint responsibility for educators, labor, capital, technology, and the church. We must approach it unshackled by prejudices, traditions, and disbelief. We must tackle the job with courage, confidence, and intelligence. Nothing is done, finally and right. Nothing is known, positively and completely. The world is ours—all of it that matters."[109]

A name destined to become increasingly famous in the next three decades appeared among the contributors to *Publicity Problems* in late 1943. It was that of S. I. Hayakawa, at that time professor of English at Illinois Institute of Technology. Hayakawa, giving ACPA members an exposure to semantics, pointed up another important aspect of their role in a democratic society.[110]

"Publicity men, in common with preachers, educators, teachers, radio men, newspapermen, magazine writers, novelists, poets, etc., are the creators of the semantic environment in which our society lives," he declared, adding, "It is a terrible responsibility. The reaction of a human being to a situation is often due to what we, as manipulators of the semantic environment, do to him. . . .

"The democratic notion of freedom of communication, freedom of speech and thought are positive guarantees that our semantic environment will remain complicated so that the individual will have a choice and exercise that choice. What we try to do in semantics in applying this education is to get people to see that this confusion, this battle of conflicting ideas, is a necessary condition in a democracy and that it is our job to wade our way through the multitude of choices and choose intelligently among them. . . .

"Our educational program in semantics is to get people to understand the nature of multiple choices and awaken in them the sense of responsibility and get them to assume the responsibility. Insofar as they can do this, they can be effective citizens in a democracy. If they fail and want to throw themselves on someone else's bosom and get the answers, they are inevitably headed toward a dictatorship."

Elementary steps in the broad field of public relations were emphasized in four pages of *Publicity Problems* for February, 1944, devoted to an address which Whittlesey, in collaboration with Emerson Reck, had prepared for delivery at a meeting of Methodist Church educators in Cincinnati.[111]

"Public relations," Whittlesey said, "is a constant thing—a changing thing—a challenging, enormous, and infinitesimal thing; a comfortable auditorium with good acoustics; a pleasant smile; a splendidly executed radio program; a kind word; a beautiful campus; a letter of appreciation; a competent faculty; a satisfied customer."

That publicity, even when it seems to be entirely constructive, may be a waste of money and in reality poor public relations, was emphasized in the address.

"It is important to remember," said Whittlesey, "that an institution must do everything possible to eliminate misunderstanding and establish understanding. It must be diligent in its efforts to create good will. It should be prepared to give maximum service before having the spotlight of publicity turned upon it. Even that is not enough. An institution must be alert always to sense reaction to policies and note changes in sentiment and trends of the times. In other words, the public relations program is both corrective and interpretative, if it is properly managed, and the corrective phase of it should come first wherever possible."

The March issue of *Publicity Problems* announced that two of ACPA's national officers, Whittlesey and Editor Kingsley W. Given, also a member of the public information staff at Western Reserve, were taking new jobs. Whittlesey, who had been with the Cleveland institution since 1937, had become an associate with Edward L. Bernays, New York public relations counsel, on March 1. Given would become director of announcements at Union College in Schenectady, New York, on July 1.

Whittlesey, finding New York City less to his liking than anticipated, was back in the college field within two months as director of public relations at the University of Denver.[112]

With many men in the various fields accepting "temporary jobs" with Uncle Sam, women were taking over their posts with advertising agencies, publicity bureaus, publications, manufacturers, department stores, and radio networks. A survey on the subject prepared by N. W. Ayer and Son was summarized in *Publicity Problems*: "The war has brought to women unusual opportunities in the advertising and publicity fields. Because the women in these jobs have done and are doing well, any lingering prejudice against them is fast dying out. The day may soon come when *all* agencies, advertising departments, publications, will declare, as one of the nation's biggest dailies does now, 'We pick the person we want, regardless of whether that person is a man or a girl'."[113] ACPA's membership roster for 1943-44 carried the names of 110 women but many more were undoubtedly heading publicity offices inasmuch as the memberships of forty-two institutions were designated under the anonymity of the phrase, "publicity director."[114]

To gain ammunition for his talks with prospective advertisers in *Publicity Problems*, Business Manager Paul Ridings conducted a market survey and in the process gained some interesting data. Reporting in *Publicity Problems*, he revealed that the average Association member performed a number of varied duties while going about his work. Forty-three percent were faculty advisers for college papers and thirty-two percent for yearbooks; twenty-nine percent had charge of athletic programs; twenty percent directed all printing at their institutions; nearly seventy-five percent took some of their own pictures. ACPA members were spending approximately $2,663,000 for printing, engraving, photography, and mats. Of this amount $2,077,769 was going for printing, $337,297 for engravings, $110,211 for mats, $137,631 for pictures. Total budgets of ACPA members, according to Ridings, approximated $3,430,600.[115]

The most significant ACPA publication in 1943-44 was a comprehensive survey report on postwar education published just before the Association's war conference held in Chicago in early May. Titled *Postwar Education in American Colleges and Universities*, it completed a project which the Executive Committee had authorized Arthur L. Brandon, vice president for research, to start six months earlier. The survey, it was believed, would serve two purposes: to provide data which would be useful in educational planning, and to point up the value of fact finding in public relations.[116] The survey report was made possible by the cooporation of 143 college presidents in forty-one states and the District of Columbia.[117]

Most colleges had adopted some form of acceleration in order to help their students secure additional formal education before entering military or other war service. Questions put to presidents in the survey revealed that a majority thought accelerated, nearly year-round programs should be discontinued after the war. The presidents were even more opposed to continuing the concentrated programs of twenty or more hours weekly. Only ten favored such schedules, generally popular in military programs. Colgate University President Everett Case expressed the sentiment of many when he said, "I think our objective should be to see how far we can take our students educationally in four years, not how quickly they can meet certain minimum requirements."[118]

Of the 143 institutions represented in the survey, 103 had military programs during the war. Now 103—not necessarily all of those with wartime programs—thought that, should the United States in the future adopt compulsory military training for physically able youth, part of this training should coincide with college education and be available in colleges for those able to do college work. Eighty-three of the presidents thought that such training, at government expense, should be provided only in the colleges if the student was able to do college work.[119]

The presidents were nearly unanimous in believing that the federal government should pay the tuition of World War II veterans if they were able to do college work and wanted to continue their education in college. Almost as many, 115, thought living expenses should also be covered and 109 thought government allowances should cover books. "Up to four years" was the most frequent reply to a question on length of subsidy.[120]

Wartime needs had stimulated college offerings in the fields of medicine, nursing, science, management, engineering, and mathematics, but eighty presidents believed there would be a shift from these subjects after the war, most generally to the humanities, general education, liberal arts, or social sciences.

The presidents believed that history, modern languages, and political science were especially likely to receive greater student attention after the war.[121]

Only seventy presidents anticipated "a marked increase" in the number of separate junior colleges after the war. They agreed almost unanimously, however, that such increase, if it came, would be in publicly-financed institutions, most of them emphasizing vocational education or a combination of vocational and cultural. Very few—eleven—believed that many four-year colleges would shift to or include a two-year Bachelor of Arts degree course.[122]

In the past two decades, adult education programs had become increasingly popular with both colleges and the general populace. One hundred sixteen of the presidents participating in Brandon's survey anticipated significant expansion in this field of education and in practically all areas of interest.[123]

The survey secured information on various aspects of college finance, including endowments, tuition, alumni funds, special campaigns, scholarships, loan funds, and teachers' salaries. Forty-four colleges reported that the amount of their endowment had increased during the war, but only thirty-three said that endowment income had increased. On the other hand only twenty-two reported decreased endowment income. Thirty-five colleges reported increased income from tuition over the similar term or semester in 1942-43, forty-five reported less.[124]

Only sixty-five of the colleges had alumni funds in 1943-44, the survey revealed. Nearly seventy percent of these reported that both the amount received and the number of givers had increased since 1941. At the same time seventy-five of the colleges had made efforts to secure special funds for such things as buildings, current expenses, endowment, scholarships, loan funds, and debt elimination. Most of the colleges, eighty-six, reported that all of their funds available for scholarships and fellowships were being used. On the other hand, ninety-eight said that not all their money available for student loans had been used.[125]

In only one institution included in the survey were teachers' salaries less than they had been in 1941-42. In only eighty-seven, however, were they more.[126]

Presidents, the survey showed, were generally convinced that there would be "a marked increase in enrollment of nonmilitary students after the war." Only fifteen believed otherwise. Moreover, seventy-nine of the administrators thought that the increase would be permanent.[127]

Because building programs had gone by the board since 1941, and because increased enrollment and services were expected in the postwar period, all but sixteen of the college presidents replying to the survey questionnaire indicated that they were planning postwar building projects. A few already had available the money for their projects; sixty-six others had part of that needed in hand.[128]

Although many colleges in recent years had cooperated with business, industry, and professional groups in arranging special programs or short courses in such fields as banking, personnel and labor relationships, and social welfare, only forty of the colleges surveyed had committees working with business and industry on postwar cooperation in the education of youth.[129]

In the quarter century preceding World War II, few problems had been more troublesome for educators than intercollegiate athletics, football especially. Despite this fact the ACPA survey of 1944 revealed that only twenty-two participating presidents were taking advantage of the "breathing spell" to have committees study such matters as athletic subsidization, scholarships, and so-called overemphasis on intercollegiate teams. Moreover, 106 indicated that they expected intercollegiate athletics, in general, to return to their prewar status.[130]

Within a few days after its publication the Brandon survey had received nationwide publicity through stories carried by the news services and editorials in leading newspapers. Comments in several magazines followed. In a column-long feature on its education page, the New York *Times* lauded the project as "The educational study of the year." Greatest satisfaction of all, however, resulted from the fact that the study provided a guide for postwar planning on many campuses.

Two other surveys concerning postwar education, one concerning the opinions of civilian college students, the other concerning those of students in military units, were planned by Brandon during 1943-44. The one with military students, however, had to be abandoned, first because of inability to get a significant questionnaire approved by military authorities and secondly because of the virtual elimination of the Army Specialized Training Program before final arrangements for any survey instrument could be completed.[131]

Several thousand civilian students representing all areas of the country except the west coast returned their questionnaire. The job of compiling and analyzing results was so large that Brandon was unable to complete it until well along in 1944-45. When finally released, the findings in this survey would also gain national attention and bring added prestige to ACPA.

When ACPA held its war conference at the Medinah Club in Chicago May 3-6, 1944, postwar education was one of the subjects holding major attention, first through a panel composed of top administrators from four colleges and universities, and later in the reports of committees and officers.

Administrators participating in the panel—Dr. Henry T. Heald, president of Illinois Institute of Technology; Dr. Fred C. Wiegman, president of Midland College; Dr. Deane W. Malott, chancellor of the University of Kansas, and Dr. Carter Davidson, president of Knox College—foresaw a variety of postwar problems influencing public relations. They were especially uneasy about the prospect of overemphasis on technical education and of growing government influence on college programs.[132]

President Whittlesey throughout his administration had pressed hard on the subject of postwar education. But in his address opening the Chicago convention he saw educators' greatest challenges coming before the fighting ended.

"Our biggest job and greatest responsibility is ahead. The crucial period in higher education is before us," he said. "I am not worried about higher education's role in the postwar period. That has been completely studied and blueprinted and the men in our armed forces are looking forward in large numbers to the day when they can take up college work again. In the interim, however, there is real danger that the entire structure of higher education may disintegrate. . . . The American people, if they recognize the problem, would not permit such a catastrophe. . . . It is up to us, with their help, to head it off."

Whittlesey saw "six fundamental R's which promise to be contenders for the bulk of our attention from this day until the end of the war" and challenged his colleagues to emphasize them in their interpretation job of the coming months. The six, he said, were: race relations; reconversion, including the retention and retraining of men; reintegration of veterans; foreign relations; public relations; and religion. He added that a seventh R—research—would play a substantial supporting role.[133]

With all too many Americans the prestige of higher education had declined during the war because so much had been made of "the college professors and crackpots" in Washington. Therefore, ACPA had requested Bernard Lichtenberg, founder and president of the Institute of Public Relations, to present his ideas on "Reselling Higher Education to America."

"The first problem for the college," he said in his address, "is to review what it offers its student body, not in the light of popular preferences or prejudices of the moment, but rather in terms of fundamental educational values. . . . Secondly, each college must determine the groups whose good will is vital to the institution. . . . In the third place, and most important, a positive program should be devised for winning the good will of each of these groups. This calls for public relations on its highest plane.

"A clear distinction must be drawn between a comprehensive public relations program and publicity," Lichtenberg continued. "The distinction is similar to that between medicine and surgery; public relations corresponds to medicine and publicity to surgery. The aim of medicine is to keep the human being healthy. Surgery is one means to that end, but one that should be used only where it is called for and is suitable. Indiscriminate surgery can do far more harm than good, and could prove fatal. Indiscriminate publicity is just as bad."

Lichtenberg emphasized that the aim of public relations is to win public respect and good will for an institution. "Publicity is one, and only one means to that end," he asserted. "The personal contacts of faculty and students with other groups in the community, public functions such as forums and lectures conducted by the college, books and articles written by faculty members, outside educational, social, and business activities of the faculty, the record of the alumni and what they say about the college in after life, all these are factors in public relations.

"If these activities are conducted effectively and intelligently, the net result is bound to be to win many new friends for the college, to regain any old friends who have become indifferent, and incidentally, to do our bit to strengthen public support for our national system of education."

Lichtenberg reminded his listeners that each situation must be considered on an individual basis.

"There are certain forms of public relations that have little to do with publicity," he asserted. "The attitude of the various publics toward a client's company may be influenced by many other things besides the stories they read in the papers. Primarily, the quality of the product or services—and such things as the manner and appearance of the client's salesmen and deliverymen, the packaging of the product, the promptness of the service, even the voices and good manners of the girls who answer his phone—all influence the client's standing with the public by whose good opinion he stands or falls. All these points have their part in a public relations appraisal and program—and none of them has to do with printed publicity."[134]

Another speaker who emphasized the importance of the comprehensive public relations program was E. M. Claypool, chief public relations officer of the Illinois Central Railroad.

"I am not the public relations director," he told the ACPA delegates. "I am an assistant in public relations because every employee of our railroad is a public relations officer. Every student in every one of your colleges and universities is a public relations officer. Every alumnus is a public relations officer. The people with whom they live and come in contact judge the institution from which they were graduated, or from which they were not graduated, by that individual. If that individual is not sold on the college or university he attended, naturally his friends, associates, and family are not sold, either, and so you can carry the application on through."[135]

It was becoming evident to ACPA leaders, especially in the light of Arthur Brandon's survey, that members of the Association were destined to become increasingly involved in the fund-raising efforts of their institutions. As a consequence, one of the general sessions at the Chicago convention was devoted to the theme, "Fund Raising for Higher Education." Ideas on the subject were presented by James Almond, president of American City Bureau, and Thomas A. Gonser, vice president of Northwestern University.[136]

Although public relations facets were emphasized during the convention, the program also covered nearly every imaginable phase of publicity, including principles with which newcomers needed to be fully acquainted. Two business sessions at which the delegates heard and acted upon the reports of ten committees and eleven officers rounded out the program. The convention addresses, papers, and reports filled 407 pages of typewritten copy which the newly-elected associate editor, Trennie Eisley of Bucknell University, was finally able to boil down to 167 pages in *Publicity Digest*.

Awards for the year, as recommended by the committee headed by John DeCamp, went to *School and Society* for distinguished service in the interpretation of higher education; to Robert W. Madry, University of North Carolina, for distinguished service and unselfish devotion to the Association over a long period of time; to W. Emerson Reck of Colgate for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of higher education during the current year; and to George L. Shiebler of New York University for outstanding achievement in sports publicity in the current year. This award was henceforth to be known as the Helms Athletic Foundation Award, for ACPA's Executive Committee had accepted the offer of the prestigious foundation created by philanthropist Paul Helms to be the co-sponsor.[137] Honorary life memberships were conferred upon Eleanor Nangle and Andrew Pavlin of the Chicago *Tribune*, the reporter-photographer team which for several years had visited campuses throughout the country as the creators and producers of a feature known as "Youth on the Campus."[138]

Also upon the recommendation of DeCamp's committee and the Committee on Constitution headed by Elmer G. Sulzer of the University of Kentucky, the delegates revised the constitution to provide for annual awards for the most effective jobs of institutional radio work and institutional motion picture work.[139]

The Committee on War Cooperation, chaired by Frederick S. Osborne of Princeton, reported that working arrangements made with the War and Navy Departments in the preceding year had been reviewed and found generally satisfactory. He indicated, however, that the current committee had had no greater success than its predecessors in arranging for cooperative relationships between ACPA and other war agencies. "However, the talents of individual members," he reported, "have been enlisted by local, state, and national war agencies and the sum total of the contributions they are making is one of which ACPA may well be proud."

Before and during the convention there was increased talk of substituting public relations for publicity in the name of the Association, as first suggested just a decade earlier by Josef F. Wright. No organized effort was made to bring about the change at this time; but reports of several committees, notably those on public relations and publicity, postwar planning, central office, and resolutions, emphasized the realization of ACPA members that their jobs were fast outgrowing the confines of publicity.

The Committee on Postwar Planning, under the leadership of Douglass W. Miller of Syracuse University, made a series of recommendations nearly all of which related to public relations aspects of the Association's work. Notable among the recommendations, later endorsed with enthusiasm by the delegates, were these: (1) that the present Committee on Public Relations and Publicity, or another committee especially named for the purpose, be empowered to represent the Association in an effort to bring to college and university administrators a more complete concept of public relations and a realization of its importance; (2) that *Publicity Problems* and the programs of national and regional meetings be used extensively to acquaint the membership with the techniques of sampling, testing, and polling public opinion; (3) that a policy committee be created for the purpose of promoting greater unity of effort and voice among national associations in the advancement of the interests of higher education in general.

Harold Schellenger's Committee on Public Relations and Publicity reported progress along the lines Miller was suggesting. Individual letters intended to promote greater understanding of public relations and ACPA's involvement had gone to the president of every college in the country—approximately 1,700 at that time—and the response "had exceeded all expectations." Consulting services of ACPA had also been offered to state associations of teachers. The first such service had been provided to the Connecticut State Teachers Association by Eleanor Mosely Collier.

Mrs. Collier reported that the Central Office Committee had continued to make contacts with individuals and organizations who might be helpful in establishing a national office. The Association of American Colleges, American Council on Education, and the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association had expressed interest but taken no action.

The Resolutions Committee, headed by A. L. Marting of Baldwin-Wallace College, presented a series of resolutions which showed how the interests of ACPA members were expanding as duties and responsibilities grew. Most significant of these resolutions were those concerning foreign policy. The Association favored a foreign policy which would "make the United States an active and forward-looking member of the world family of nations, working continuously and intelligently in behalf of world peace through education." Other resolutions were passed endorsing the establishment, at the earliest possible moment, of an international office of education; speaking for better racial and religious understanding; urging that the current tax exemptions on gifts for educational, religious, and charitable purposes be maintained and if possible increased; and instructing Association officers to seek modification of those sections of the standard contracts with the Veterans Administration for Rehabilitation Training which seemed to hamper academic freedom as well as freedom of the press.[140]

The report of Secretary-Treasurer E. Ross Bartley was applauded with enthusiasm when it revealed: (1) that membership had increased nearly twenty percent and stood at 439; (2) that the beginning of an endowment fund for the Association had been made with the receipt of three $25 war bonds, one each from Whittlesey, Mrs. Collier, and T. T. Frankenberg; and (3) that advertising revenue from *Publicity Problems* had increased ten-fold over 1942-43, from $82.50 to $820.60. The Association's net worth, while shrinking $583.82 in the past year, still stood at $1,717.56.[141]

Arthur L. Brandon, who had served as public relations officer at Bucknell University, University of Texas, and Vanderbilt University since joining the Association in 1929, and had held the vice presidencies for membership and research recently, was chosen as the Association's new president at the final business session. Elected to serve with him were: vice presidents, Max E. Hannum, Carnegie Institute of Technology, membership; Horace Renegar, Tulane University, research; Edward H. Stromberg, Northwestern University, regions; P. Caspar Harvey, William Jewell College, radio, reelected; W. Henry Johnston, Lawrence College, athletics; and Alice B. Vosburgh, Smith College, women's activities; secretary-treasurer, E. Ross Bartley, Indiana University, reelected; editor, Harold K. Schellenger, Ohio State University; associate editor, Trennie E. Eisley, Bucknell University; business manager, Paul O. Ridings, Illinois Institute of Technology, reelected. The University of Kentucky was selected as the 1945 convention site and Elmer G. Sulzer, director of public relations there, was named convention secretary.[142]

With the cooperation of ACPA, short courses in public relations, the first ever sponsored by educational institutions, were held at Scarritt College in Nashville, Tennessee, and at Syracuse University in July, 1944. Stewart Harral, Emerson Reck, and President-elect Brandon were ACPA speakers at Scarritt, where the seminar was also sponsored by the Department of Public Relations or the Methodist Board of Education. At Syracuse Reck gave a series of five lectures which, with discussion periods following, formed the backbone of the three-day program.

Twelve of the sixty persons who came from twenty-eight institutions to attend the short course at Scarritt on July 10-11 were college presidents. One of these presidents, Hubert T. Quillian of LaGrange (Georgia) College, summarized the course thus in the September-October issue of *Christian Education Magazine*:

"Genuine and practical guidance and constructive suggestions stimulated the thinking of all who attended this course. One is reminded of the story of the mountaineer who was asked on the witness stand if he could read or write. He responded, 'I can read figgers, but I can't read writin'. If I see a sign on the side of the road, I can tell how fur but I can't tell whar to'. Our leaders in this conference gave us a sense of direction. They not only knew how far, but they also knew 'whar to'."

Almost fifty persons from a dozen states, among them college presidents, assistants to presidents, alumni secretaries, registrars, and deans as well as directors of publicity, public information, and public relations, attended the seminar at Syracuse. Reporting in *Publicity Problems*, Douglass Miller, who directed the program and also lectured on various facets of publicity and public relations, said: "The seminar . . . conceived as a project to bring public relations personnel and representative college presidents together for joint consideration of public relations problems, attained two distictive results. . . . It demonstrated the values to be gained from a consideration of public relations not merely by those charged with its direction but by a varied and representative group of college and university administrators. Further, it set a new pattern in that its theme was definitely 'public relations' and not 'publicity'."

Pioneering ventures, the seminars at Scarritt and Syracuse set the pattern for programs which two decades later became permanent fixtures in the Association's much enlarged list of services.[143]

The Association Changes Name

Wartime restrictions on travel compelled ACPA to cancel its 1945 convention and several district conventions. The officers elected at Chicago served, in accordance with the organization's constitution, until the next national convention could be held in May, 1946. Despite the travel restrictions and other problems spawned by World War II, the 1944-46 period was one of the most productive in the Association's history. Many of the policies adopted and services added during the next quarter century had their origin in the thinking and planning which took place during the biennium Arthur Brandon presided over the organization.

"Mr. Brandon has always done more than he was paid for," columnist Stan Baumgartner of the Philadelphia *Inquirer* wrote about the ACPA leader in 1939. At that time, Brandon was leaving work in the East to become director of public relations and associate professor of journalism at the University of Texas. Early in life Brandon had learned the values of conscientious effort when he worked his way through Broaddus (now Alderson-Broaddus) College in his native town of Philippi, West Virginia. And although he was of beanpole build, the scholarly-looking Brandon left at Broaddus an athletic record equalled to this day by only two other men in the college's history: letterman in four sports as quarterback and captain in football, forward in basketball, centerfielder in baseball, and captain of the tennis team.[144]

In 1973, Brandon's alma mater, which had conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters upon him in 1961, paid him even greater tribute by naming the humanities wing of its new humanities-social science building Brandon Hall. It was the consummate honor for Brandon, who had been a volunteer worker for the little West Virginia college for many years. He had helped it raise nearly $5 million during four years as its vice president, a job pressed upon him in 1969 after he had twice retired. He retired for the first time in 1964, from a vice presidency at New York University. But he soon returned to work, serving as acting president of Ellen Cushing Junior College, as president and board chairman of both the National Accreditation Council of Agencies Serving the Blind and the Green Lake (Wisconsin) Center of the American Baptist Assembly, and then for two years as a part-time consultant for the Ford Foundation's program for black colleges.[145]

The secret of Brandon's leadership can be grasped from the comments of individuals who worked with him. "He is," said a writer for a student publication at New York University where he was vice president for university relations from September, 1957, to January 1964, "a man who looks like a clergyman, speaks with the precision of a professor, and exudes the enthusiasm of a quarterback driving for the winning touchdown."[146]

" 'Contact men' are usually pictured as raucous glad-handers but there is little of the thumper-on-the-back about 'Brandon," wrote a columnist in the Austin *American Statesman* a few weeks after the ACPA leader had assumed a University of Texas post. "Fortyish, quiet, and with a nice premature greyness, he meets people easily and makes friends with them because he's a good guy himself."[147]

Two others whose comments give understanding of Brandon's leadership qualities are William A. Spencer, assistant to the chancellor at Indiana University-Purdue University in Indianapolis, and Cleland Wyllie, director of media services at the University of Michigan.

"Nobody ever really worked for Art," declared Spencer, who was director of information services at New York University while Brandon was there. "He pretty much gave his department directors free rein, then got verbal briefings on operations. One of his techniques is to get to know, by name, people at all levels of an institution—guards, cleaning women, secretaries, etc."[148]

"Art inspired intense loyalty on the part of all who worked with him," said Wyllie, who had worked in Michigan's information office with Brandon from 1946 to 1957, when the latter served first as director of information services, then as director of university relations. "Art was no doubt the ideal choice to lay the ground work for university-wide public relations activity here [Michigan]," he continued. "His kindly, friendly attitude inspired faculty support which was so essential."[149]

Brandon had served continuously in ACPA since 1939, when he went to the University of Texas after four years as executive assistant and associate director of the American Council on Education's Youth Commission. His speeches, articles, and reports (he had been a vice president since 1941) always reflected a broad concept of public relations which included the initiation of public services and cooperative projects extending a college's educational program. And now, as president of ACPA, he dedicated himself completely to the job of awakening colleagues and administrators alike to the challenges, opportunities, and responsibilities inherent in the broad-gauge job of public relations.

"Because of the enlarged experience and expanded horizons of many millions of American citizens, the demands for higher education in the future will be heavier and more diversified than ever before," Brandon wrote in "Come In, ACPA!" the lead article in the first issue of *Publicity Problems* for 1944-45. "These demands will be at all levels, from the junior college through the graduate and professional schools," he asserted. "But generally they will not be the passive, easily satisfied requests with which education has frequently dealt. They will be the demands of matured, knowing men for professional advancement, social well-being, and personal satisfactions. . . .

"To make ready for the new day they [the colleges] must restudy their objectives and evaluate public opinion and public needs. In a sense, there is no longer such a thing as a private institution. All colleges are public to the extent that they must be concerned with meeting responsibilities to the public, or cease to exist. But it is not enough that they keep an ear to the ground or a finger on the pulse to sound out public needs and desires. Their high office is to help formulate that opinion and direct that need. Education should be a force in the direction and betterment of *human relations*—a broader term than public relations—or it is missing its prime objective."

Brandon ended his article with five suggestions which, he said, were not meant to be an ACPA platform but merely "a statement of some of the desires your president has for future progress":

> (1) Strive toward making "United in the Service of Higher Education" a reality, not merely a slogan.
>
> (2) Learn all that we can about the broad principles and purposes of education with a conviction that we have a function as educators as well as reporters of education, important though that be.
>
> (3) Study public opinion with a view to weighing it and its values for education, and for influencing it for the advancement of general well-being.
>
> (4) Absorb all the principles of effective public relations that we can and practice them not because we want something from our publics but because of our obligation to them.
>
> (5) Increase the fellowship and fraternity among ourselves with a desire to exchange information about procedures and to enjoy the personal relationships with each other.[150]

Explaining that committees would have very important functions in ACPA's total program, Brandon announced in October, 1944, the chairmen he and his Executive Committtee had selected for key groups. He and the Executive Committee invited the various committees to come to Lexington for meetings at least half a day early the following May, and asked the chairmen to meet with the Executive Committee afterward to discuss their plans and reports. One new committee, Plans and Policies, was being set up, with Emerson Reck of Colgate as chairman, to consider various proposals coming before the Association, evaluate them for their long-range contributions, and make recommendations to the membership.[151] This committee was appointed following a recommendation made at the Chicago convention by the Committee on Postwar Planning.

Following up on his message to the membership in "Come In, ACPA!" Brandon sent a seven-page memo to members of the Executive Committee, chairmen of committees, district directors, and past presidents. Almost two of the seven pages were devoted to public relations with accent on the shift in emphasis from publicity to public relations, efforts to cooperate with other organizations, and the matter of changing the Association's name.

"In education as in other fields," Brandon wrote, "there has been a gradual shift in emphasis from publicity to the broader area of public relations. It is the belief of many ACPA members that we must be alert to the new opportunities. . . . To assist us all, the Association has in recent years and with increasing emphasis at present published considerable material on public relations. This year the national conference at Lexington will devote most of its sessions to public relations. Likewise, the district meetings will stress public relations. This does not mean that the national and district programs will not offer also the fundamentals for the management of news offices, etc. In fact, the effort will be to show how newspaper publicity, radio broadcasts, conferences, publications, and correspondence help make up public relations. We must educate ourselves to the larger job."

Greatest efforts of the Committee on Public Relations during the year, Brandon reported, would be with other educational organizations such as the Association of American Colleges, the American Council on Education (ACE), the National Education Association (NEA), and the Division of Higher Education of the U. S. Office of Education. Brandon wrote that meetings had been held, or correspondence exchanged, with all of these organizations on how they and ACPA could work together on common goals of public relations for higher education. The Association of American Colleges had indicated definite interest in having a public relations session at its national meeting in January and later arranged for Reck and Douglass Miller to take brief leaves from their institutions to plan and execute public relations programs for its 1945 convention. During the convention the Association of American Colleges created a Commission on Public Relations to include six college presidents, Brandon, and Reck. With assurance from ACPA that it would provide cooperative services, the Educational Policies Commission of NEA and the Plans and Policies Committee of ACE were also creating committees on public relations.

Brandon said that the matter of name change, on the basis of action taken by the Executive Committee, was being referred to a special committee headed by Josef F. Wright of the University of Illinois. "Some members," he wrote, "have been recommending this [substituting Public Relations for Publicity in the Association name] for at least three or four years, but it has not been presented to the membership for discussion because it was believed that there were not yet enough colleges where emphasis was on public relations. Now the situation has changed, partly because of increased demands for varied services by war-related activities." Brandon assured members no name change would be rushed through. Comments and suggestions were to be sent to Wright whose committee, if a new name was selected, would refer its recommendation to the Constitution Committee, headed by William Wranek, Jr., of the University of Virginia. Notice of the proposed change would then be given in *Publicity Problems* before being discussed by the Executive Committee and finally brought before the membership for action at Lexington.

For the first time since the war started, all of ACPA's districts had a director. By November 27 all but one of them had made plans for meetings. Success of the cooperative seminars held at Scarritt College in Nashville and at Syracuse University the preceding July had led to plans for other programs of a similar nature, some of them in conjunction with district meetings. By the time he relinquished the presidential reins, Brandon would be able to report that seven such seminars had been held.

Brandon's memo also warned that strong action was probably needed to prevent ACPA members from being used by gambling interests. Some distributors of "dope sheets," it seemed, were requesting team captains or other leading players to supply information each week on the mental and physical condition of their teams, especially star players, and on any other factors that might prove useful in making predictions. Some college sports information men were also being solicited weekly for "dope" on their teams by an agency believed to be supplying information for betting purposes. W. Henry Johnston, vice president for athletics, was drawing recommendations to be made to the Executive Committee. Brandon in his memo commented: "I have very strong feelings that if college sports publicity directors cooperate in supplying any type of information to gambling dope sheets or forms, the colleges are headed for a bad public relations situation."[152]

Shortly the Associated Press reported in a story released nationally that "college publicity men move to check big-time gamblers." The story, based on information supplied by Johnston, announced that the Association's 439 members "would launch an all-out effort to keep large-scale gambling out of collegiate sports."[153] The story said that the Association's Executive Committee had called upon all members to join an organized campaign to stifle big-time betting on college contests by refusing information to gamblers. The first step in the campaign, Johnston reported, was to be the removal of all doubtful persons from the mailing lists of college and university sports publicity departments.

Johnston continued his battle against gambling on college contests with three articles in the winter issues of *Publicity Problems*. Eventually, he was able to report cooperative action by the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Football Writers Association. When in the spring of 1945 questionnaires and requests for advance information on college football squads began to arrive on the desks of sports information directors, Johnston issued a statement advising ACPA members to give information only to "recognized press associations and feature syndicates whose use of the material is known to be legitimate; recognized newspapers, magazines, and radio commentators; and individuals or organizations known to the athletic officials and sports publicity officers for their proper handling of such materials."[154]

Although rapid growth was being predicted for frequency modulation broadcasting, popularly known as FM, colleges were showing no alacrity in seeking channel assignments, an article in *Publicity Problems* by Paul A. Walker of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) revealed. The FCC had held extensive hearings on frequency modulation in March, 1940, had received requests that definite assignments be made to education for this type of broadcasting, and had reserved five channels for educational institutions. As of July 1, 1944, only one university in the country was operating an FM station and construction permits had been granted to two others.

"In view of the fact that applications for commercial stations are being filed at a rapid rate, it is imperative that educational institutions move fast, if channels now set aside are to be reserved," Walker commented. "If educational institutions do not see fit to apply for FM stations, then it might become necessary to allocate them to other applicants who realize the postwar possibilities of FM broadcasting."[155]

"Walker's "hint" stimulated action among the colleges and universities. Within two years, forty-six FM educational stations were in operation. By the time the Association observed its fiftieth anniversary in 1967 this number had risen to 318.[156]

Brandon's promise that public relations would recieve greater emphasis in *Publicity Problems* during his administration was fulfilled in 1944-45 when articles by public relations specialists in business and industry were featured along with those by leaders in ACPA. One of the best of the publication's features was an "ideas exchange" presented through a series of eight articles by Editor Harold Schellenger. In each of these articles Schellenger presented single-paragraph comments from forty or more institutions telling how their public relations had been enhanced. Such methods were listed as parents' organizations, special correspondence, unusual devices or practices, guide services, radio programs, news stories, courtesies for visitors, and efforts to get greater faculty support.

Among the nonmembers who contributed to *Publicity Problems* during the year were Ordway Tead, chairman of New York City's Board of Higher Education and editor of economic books for Harper and Brothers; Milton Fairman, director of public relations for the Borden Company, and Paul Garrett, director of public relations for the General Motors Corporation. Fairman and Garrett both served as president of the Public Relations Society of America after it was founded in 1947 as an amalgam of three lesser associations.

Tead's article on "How Public Relations Can Help Higher Education" was a feature of the first 1944-45 issue of *Publicity Problems*. "The effectiveness of public relations programs is in direct relation to the effectiveness of educational programs," said Tead.

"Educational programs are not conceived or administered in vacuum," he continued. "They embody policies and practices arrived at by collaborative effort in which often administrators, faculty, trustees, and alumni groups have shared. There is fundamentally only one way to interpret and propagandize policies and programs which have been formulated. And that way is to be a party in the first instance to the process of this formulation. Only so are they truly known by the interpreters.

"College public relations work will never amount to more than a press-agentry until the public relations officer reports as an executive assistant to the president and is explicitly a participant in all the councils where basic decisions are reached regarding the conduct of the institution and the determination of its educational policies and methods. Only so will his grasp of what he has to 'sell' be sufficiently clear and deep to make him truly effective as an educator of publics.

"With our colleges under especially critical scrutiny today, we as public relations officers can succeed in helping those colleges to a more favorable acceptance only as we help the colleges to rise above the criticisms themselves. Frankly, our colleges have to change and a part of our responsibility is to help effect that change and meanwhile to interpret that change as it proceeds."[157]

"First of all I would take the townspeople into my confidence," said Fairman in writing on "If I Were in Your Place." "I would outline to them the aims and ideals of my school. I would endeavor to make the president, the faculty, and the student body familiar parts of the civic scene. . . . I would try to sell the idea to both college and town that the collegians were community members in good standing, not rather critical tourists. . . .

"Community welfare, local health problems, civic affairs," Fairman continued, "all of these can be made a concern of the college. It would seem to be the task of the public relations department to sell this, first to the college itself and then to the community. Good public relations at home are a sound step towards good public relations abroad.

". . . I would," Fairman concluded, "make my public relations aim that of selling to college and public alike the true value of the institution to the general public as well as the student body. I would try to make my college stand out . . . as an institution of service and leadership."[158]

Garrett, who contended that "public relations is an operating philosophy," wrote in an article titled "As Industry Sees It" that "public relations are all the things one does to make friends for a company in the hope of making customers for its products. That is why management must take its public relations into account with each decision. Every management decision bears on public acceptance of a company's product, or of the institution back of that product."

"The men responsible for public relations in a company must keep constantly in touch with and be a part of all management policy decisions and projects that concern the public," Garrett continued. "It does not follow that management must be governed in every decision by the suggestions of the public relations man. But it is the responsibility of the public relations man to make sure that public attitudes in each instance are understood and taken into account when formulating policy. Management must learn to stand, not with what people ought to think, but with what they actually do think. An opinion deeply rooted in public consciousness is just as much of a fact and just as important a fact so far as the public relations of a company is concerned as a scientific finding from a research laboratory."

Garrett concluded, "And so when I am asked how to build better public relations I say: 'Begin inside your company if you would be well thought of outside. Make each organizational decision with regard for the flow of opinion it will release in all directions. Make the policy decision that is right even though a segment of public opinion will not for the moment understand. Give people an understanding of what you stand for'."[159]

An article by Reck, "This Is Public Relations," which had appeared in the December issue of the *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, was reprinted in *Publicity Problems*. It made a clear distinction between publicity and public relations and listed in order the steps a college should take in setting up a public relations program.

"Publicity is anything which serves to gain public attention for an individual or institution," said the writer, drawing on material he was using in a forthcoming book on public relations for colleges. "Thus news stories and pictures, magazine articles, picture bulletins, radio programs, news reels, and sign boards, the principal publicity media, are only a means to an end—improved public relations.

"Public relations, however, is any situation, act, or word that influences people. . . . Arbitrary announcement of new policies, indifference to the activities of the local community, continued neglect of safety hazards, and failure to employ courteous, intelligent persons on the central switchboard—any one of these may make for a college enemies whose influence will be felt in unexpected ways and places. On the other hand, things regarded as routine, traditional, or insignificant, such as cleanliness in the college buildings, promptness in answering letters, the friendliness displayed by students and campus employees, and the economy exercised in the thin peeling of potatoes have influenced people not only to speak well of an institution but also to give five-or six-figure gifts at unexpected times. . . . Public relations, in the light of these facts, becomes simply a studied or organized effort to win friends and influence them to speak and act for an instituion."

Eleven steps were listed as essential in the process of setting up a viable public relations program: (1) Employ a person experienced in public relations to plan and direct the work; (2) make maximum use of the public relations director in a counseling capacity; (3) study the needs of the institution; (4) determine the institution's publics; (5) coordinate all public relations activities; (6) study present policies to make certain that they do not violate the principles of good public relations; (7) weigh every proposed policy to avoid hasty or unwise action; (8) educate everyone to his part in the public relations program; (9) consider every possibility for improving public relations *with* each of the institution's various publics; (10) consider every possibility for improving the institution's public relations *through* its various publics; (11) provide adequate personnel and funds for the job.

"Careful consideration of these eleven steps will reveal that public relations is largely a matter of exercising ordinary horse sense," the former ACPA president concluded. "Unfortunately, however, horse sense comes slowly to us human beings and then only when there has been a great deal of serious thinking, often coupled with worry, disappointment, criticism, and regret. An experienced public relations director, alert to the problems of higher education, can contribute in many ways to the thinking requisite for reducing worry, disappointment, criticism, and regret to a minimum for his institution."[160]

The telephone, for the first time in an ACPA publication, was emphasized as a major medium in public relations. Mrs. Jessie C. Schleich of the Ohio Bell Telephone Company responded to Editor Schellenger's invitation to write an article on "Public Relations and Your Phone."

"In telephone contacts," she wrote, "we have the disadvantage of being denied face-to-face discussion with our caller. . . . Our personality and facial expressions, such as a smiling countenance and interested attitude, are lacking. We must put our ideas and impressions across through the words we speak and the way we speak them. A pleasing, understandable voice, therefore, becomes necessary; pleasing in that it denotes personal and friendly interest in the call and understandable in that it is clear, distinct, and natural."

Summarizing after discussing a dozen rules for good telephone usage, Mrs. Schleich said: "The objective may be summed up as follows: more attentiveness, more courtesy, more helpfulness—those personal touches that make the telephone caller feel he is dealing with an individual and with an organization whose desire, first and last, is to serve his every request."[161]

ACPA's activities came to national attention once more in January when the results of Brandon's survey of civilian students and their opinions on postwar education were finally announced.

World War II, said the AP story distributed nationwide, had upset the educational timetable of many students but had not "destroyed their ambition for a degree, changed their determination to pursue preferred courses of study, or altered their belief that the prewar college is the one they want to see functioning after the war."[162]

The survey, polling approximately 4,000 students in forty-one colleges of all types, showed that only five percent favored the strictly vocational course. Ninety percent voted for a combination course, one which would emphasize "earning a living" and "how to live." Eighty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they would continue their present courses of study should the war end. Only five percent said they would abandon college permanently should their studies be cut short by the war.

Since the war began, most colleges had devised programs of "acceleration" with year-round schedules and/or a "concentrated" schedule calling for twenty or more credit hours' work per week. The AP story revealed that students participating in the Brandon survey had voted sixty-seven percent against continuing the program of acceleration and eighty percent against the concentrated program. The survey found that thirty-five percent of the students believed that they would need some financial aid to finish college. An equal number said they might need aid. Most students preferred to work part-time or obtain a scholarship.

Later in the year the Association again received wide attention when Horace Renegar, vice president for research, released the results of three surveys he had made. The first two, appearing on consecutive weekends, were concerned with athletics, the third with cooperation between colleges and industry.

Ninety-seven of 102 college presidents cooperating in the first survey would let the veteran athlete back from the war compete in sports at any institution he might choose, rather than restrict him to the institution he had previously attended. Ninety-eight presidents believed that varsity time played by veterans before entering the armed forces should count against their years of eligibility.

Additional statistics released a week later by Renegar revealed that more than ninety-six percent of the lettermen athletes at 119 colleges and universities in 1941 had been found physically fit for service in the armed forces. Only 358 of 9,635 men who won varsity letters at the 119 colleges in 1941 had been rejected because of physical handicaps. Reports from 110 institutions showed that they had collectively awarded 72,809 letters to athletes between 1930 and 1941 and that 24,326 of these had since become commissioned officers in military service. The survey disclosed that there was a combined total of 883 varsity teams at the cooperating colleges in 1940-41 and that this number had shrunk to 479 in 1944-45. Football had been hardest hit; 122 colleges had fielded teams in the gridiron sport in 1940, but only sixty-one had teams in 1944. With one exception, presidents participating in the survey believed that intercollegiate athletics should be continued.[163]

Renegar's third survey report revealed that many industrial corporations were planning to transfer their research activities from private laboratories to colleges and universities after the war. Of 238 corporations giving complete replies to the ACPA survey, 145 indicated they were currently conducting research programs and seventy-seven of these said they planned to transfer these programs to colleges if the institutions agreed to provide personnel and facilities. Seventy-four corporations said they were already spending money on college-based research and sixty revealed that they were presently using faculty members as consultants. Sixty-two indicated they would consider endowing college research programs. Most of the corporations said they would require ownership of discoveries made from research under their support.[164]

As Americans began preparing their income tax returns for 1943, thousands were taking deductions for sons and daughters in college. ACPA rejoiced over the fact that it had had a part in securing these exemptions. The Association at its 1942 convention had passed a resolution, sponsored by Homer M. Dunham of Wester Michigan State Teachers College, urging tax exemptions for families with children between eighteen and twenty-one in attendance at college. Copies of the resolution, backed by letters from many individuals, had gone to Henry Morgentheau, secretary of the treasury, and the chairmen of the proper committees in the House and Senate. The campaign, joined by other educational associations, had brought results late in 1943.[165]

As early as January, after War Mobilization Director James Byrnes had issued a statement restricting travel for conventions and meetings attracting more than fifty persons, members realized that the 1945 convention scheduled for May 7-10 might have to be cancelled. With the ban still in force, Brandon in the April issue of *Publicity Problems* announced that the convention would be rescheduled for a time approximately two months following the lifting of the ban, unless the meeting would thus be thrown into November. "In that case," he said, "the convention probably will be dropped for this year and be rescheduled at some time around the first of May, 1946."[166]

By late April there was still no indication when the ban on conventions would be lifted. Brandon prepared an interim report which took up more than five pages of *Publicity Problems* for May, 1945, and reviewed the year's advances under five heads: "District Activities," "Shift in Emphasis to Public Relations," "Cooperation With Others," "Membership and Finances," and "A Look at the Future." Although all but one district in the fall had had plans underway for meetings, only nine had so far seen those plans materialize. Those which had been unable to meet were urged to do so before the end of the fiscal year and all districts were asked to start plans early for 1945-46.

In discussing the shift in emphasis from publicity to public relations, and the growing importance of public relations as a profession in and out of education, Brandon pointed out that three other organizations, all with "public relations" in their names, were making strong efforts to enter the educational field although none of them was officially connected with institutions of higher education. Under "Cooperation With Others," the president elaborated on cooperative efforts mentioned earlier in this chapter with emphasis on growing opportunities. He reported that by April 25 membership had reached 458, largest since the increase of dues to $10 four years earlier. Looking to the future, Brandon stressed the importance of the work undertaken by the new Plans and Policies Committee and emphasized the need to plan at once for a project urged several times in past years: publication of a handbook on publicity and public relations.

A month later Brandon informed his Executive Committee that George Lundy, partner in Marts and Lundy, the firm with which ACPA founder T. T. Frankenberg was associated, had indicated that, with no strings whatsoever attached, the firm would be happy to provide a $1,000 grant to help produce the proposed book. Brandon asked that, for purposes of the secretary's record, the committee vote to accept the grant. Brandon also reported to his Executive Committee that the next edition of *Public Relations Directory and Yearbook* would, for the first time, carry a detailed statement concerning ACPA, at no cost to the Association.[167]

It became apparent by late May that there was very little hope that new officers could be elected in time to take up their duties by the beginning of ACPA's next fiscal year on September 1. Brandon announced that he was asking each national officer to carry on his work into the next year.[168]

The action was necessary because the Association's constitution provided for officers to be elected only at a national meeting and "hold office for the fiscal year or until their successors be elected." All officers except one, Editor Harold Schellenger, consequently continued to serve during 1945-46. Schellenger, who had accepted the editorship with the assurance he would hold the office for only one year, edited issues for the remainder of 1945. Gertrude Hall of Illinois State Normal University then took over publication of the magazine. Late in 1945, however, two of the officers, President Brandon and W. Henry Johnston, vice president for athletics, moved to new jobs. Johnston in September became associate in public relations and sports information director at Colgate, and Brandon on January 1, 1946, became director of information services at the University of Michigan after completing three years as director of special services at Vanderbilt University.

Another facet of public relations never previously covered in depth in *Publicity Problems* was discussed when a paper Brandon had presented at two seminars during the summer was published in the first 1945-46 issue under the title, "Effective Public Relations Through Special Events."

"The publicity or news value of special occasions has long been realized; the public relations value has not so readily been seen," the president wrote. "Only in recent years, since college administrators have included public relations specialists on their staffs, have such events been recognized as the rich opportunities they are for building good will and friendship in ever-widening circles."

Brandon laid down seven rules for special events. They should: (1) meet a definite need at the local, state, regional, or national level; (2) be appropriate to the sponsoring college or group and its personnel, and fit in with traditional objectives and functions of the college; (3) be planned far in advance so that all details could be carefully and thoughtfully arranged; (4) be effectively staged; (5) be adequately financed; (6) be well-publicized in advance, completely covered while in progress, and adequately summarized when finished; (7) have appropriate follow-up for interpretation and permanent values.

"Generally, it is a wise policy," Brandon concluded, "for the public relations officer to serve as one of many working on such an enterprise. The success of the endeavor depends on the participation of a large number of the college family, both administrative and teaching staffs. The head of the institution must take the lead and give both general policies and some of the important details his attention. The public relations staff, as people versed in promotional techniques, must counsel on policies, work out many details, handle all types of publicity, and implement the event through various channels before, during, and after the affair."[169]

The Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions was one of the organizations which called on ACPA for guidance during 1945-46, and after Schellenger had addressed the group in November he was urged to publish his paper in *Publicity Problems*.

"Two of the greatest obstacles to effective public relations in universities today," Schellenger said, "are first, a failure on the part of administrators to realize the comprehensiveness of the term, and second, institutional inertia. . . . The quality of teaching that goes on in our classrooms, the kind of speeches our faculty members give in their off-campus appearances, the way in which our visitors are treated, their telephone calls handled, their correspondence answered, all these are important in public relations.

"While the president of the university and his associates are negotiating with the legislators of today, the university's telephone operators and office girls may be dealing with the legislators and state officials of tomorrow. The president's future tasks may be made immeasurably more difficult, or easier, by what is happening in these lower, but all-important, relationships now. . . . Any contact with the public through any medium is a factor in public relations."[170]

In the last issue of *Publicity Problems* he edited, Schellenger featured "Opportunities in Cooperation," by Kalman B. Druck, a future president of the Public Relations Society of America. Druck, director of research and development for Carl Byoir and Associates, largest organization of its kind then in existence, saw "three areas of common interest" for public relations officers concerned with education and with industry.

"The first of these is the actual practice of public relations itself," Druck said. "I insist that public relations is a profession and that its professional status is being raised rapidly by the achievements of those in it. Like other professions, it has been accumulating its own 'body of special knowledge'—and this special knowledge, involving both the philosophy of approach and the utilization of standard tools and techniques, can be shared with profit by all public relations practitioners, whatever their individual field of interest. Since we all are members of the same profession, we obviously can gain a great deal from a freer exchange of ideas and experiences. . . .

"The second area of common interest encompasses the specific projects, problems, and programs with which you and we are concerned—or which we undertake—on behalf of the organization we represent. . . .

"The third area we share in common is in the broad field of contribution to a better America. . . . The need for action in this field is urgent for education and for industry. It is not merely something to be undertaken when time allows. It is the *sina qua non* of the daily public relations activities which you and we are conducting. Unless the broad economic-social-political system—of which the institutions you and we represent are integral parts—is healthy and progressive, then our own daily activities are doomed to eventual nullification. . . .

"The point I should like to emphasize in considering all the areas for cooperation is that many of your programs designed to 'sell' the institutions you represent and many of the programs on behalf of the institutions we represent dovetail and can gain strength and effectiveness together. There is a vast and, as yet, virtually uncharted area for specific projects that can implement the public relations endeavors with which we are concerned."[171]

The developing cooperation with the Association of American Colleges, gained momentum when the organization, at its national meeting in January, 1946, approved the establishment of a counseling service in public relations. The action was taken upon the recommendation of the Commission on Public Relations on which Brandon and Reck served with six college presidents. The terms of the agreement called for counseling by selected ACPA members at annual meetings of the Association of American Colleges, at regional meetings of administrators, and to member institutions of AAC as requested.

"While this is a modest beginning, it is one which possesses great potentialities for the benefit of the Association of American Colleges and of higher education in general," Raymond Walters, president of the University of Cincinnati and commission chairman, said in announcing the new service. "This commission records its conviction that public relations is one of the most vital factors in higher education today. Widespread understanding of what we are actually doing and what we earnestly hope to do constitutes a fundamental basis for high achievement in years to come."[172]

Reporting to the membership in February, President Brandon announced that Emerson Reck, who had written a book on educational public relations scheduled for publication during the coming summer, had accepted the Association's invitation to edit the long-discussed manual for which Marts and Lundy had made its $1,000 grant. When the Association convention was held three months later, announcement was made that the manual was being planned as a book of twenty-one chapters to be devoted entirely to publicity as a tool of public relations. Writers for all but three chapters had been recruited following a three-day meeting of a special committee composed of John DeCamp, E. Ross Bartley, Schellenger, Brandon, and Reck. Hopefully, the book would be published within a year. Harper and Brothers would be publishing the manual as well as Reck's book on educational public relations.[173]

Brandon also urged the membership to give careful thought to the preliminary report of the Plans and Policies Committee published in the February issue. The committee had been at work for more than a year with a membership of twenty-seven, including one representative from each district, one from each of the six divisions of membership, five members at large, the chairman, and his secretary. Through an eight-page questionnaire, the committee had received from 160 representative members comments and suggestions which filled ninety-nine typewritten pages after editing. Further study of the material, covering services to members, member colleges, and higher education, membership policies, organization, standards of practice, awards, publications, meetings, financing, and miscellaneous policies, was planned in preparation for discussion and final recommendations at the convention.

"For the first time," Brandon commented, "the Association has a detailed blueprint on what the members desire for the welfare of the Association and the profession. The definitive report of the committee should be useful for many, many years in the planning of ACPA activity."[174]

Of special interest to ACPA members in February was a report from the National

Association of Public Relations Counsel (NAPRC) carried in *Publicity Problems*. It revealed that twenty-one colleges and universities were now listing courses on public relations and forty-two were offering closely-allied courses in publicity, propaganda analysis, and public opinion.[175]

Travel restrictions were now removed and Association members were eager to renew old friendships as well as discuss the changing challenges, opportunities, and responsibilities of their offices. The 1946 convention was scheduled for Lexington, Kentucky, the horse center of America and the world's largest tobacco market, and seemed certain to set a new attendance record. It did, with registrations totaling nearly 200. Conference exhibits likewise set a record with 675 pieces of literature on display from 135 institutions.

Unofficially, the conference also went down as the longest on record. About forty delegates arrived on Sunday, a day early, and eighteen stayed over on Friday and Saturday for trips to Berea College, pioneer in self-help education, and to one of the University of Kentucky's mountain listening centers.

The program itself, although focusing on addresses, reports, and actions related to the Association's changing emphasis to public relations, paraded a galaxy of nonmember notables, including the state's governor, two former governors, two college presidents, three of the nation's leading education writers, and top men in the field of sports. It also included such never-to-be-forgotten events as a banquet at Harrodsburg's famed Beaumont Inn, a burgoo luncheon at the Keeneland race tracks, and a tour of horse farms for peeks at such famed racers of their day as Man o' War and Whirlaway.[176]

President Brandon's address on "Public Relations—a Public Trust" set the tone for the convention.

"Public relations officers," Brandon said, "have done more than any other educators in recent years to emphasize that a college has more than a limited constituency, such as students, alumni, and parents, and that if a college is to serve these wider publics it must first know their needs, then plan programs for meeting these needs. . . .

"The function of public relations officers is to get a grasp, a new conception of whom we serve in the enlarging scope of education. We must think of our goal not in terms of serving good will so much as giving public service, which of course begets good will. This public service will include an interpretation of our institutions so that people of all ages and walks of life will recognize the ever-increasing educational possibilities open to them.

"In detail, this awakening process will test our ingenuity and our own resources as institutional interpreters beyond anything we have yet tried. We must awaken a realization of what the new media of instruction can mean in small, isolated communities; we must encourage the new techniques in education by radio, and the exciting new processes of visual education. No matter how impractical some requests for extension work may seem, we must not turn a deaf ear. We must cooperate in all sound methods of experimentation, and be quick to pass on the results of successful methods, and to admit failure in unsuccessful ones. In short, we must be courageous enough to break away from purely traditional methods and recognize new approaches to learning. And most important of all, perhaps, we must seek new groups and new constituencies for learning. This is the opportunity of alert, wide awake, conscientious educators who wish to 'propagate the faith'; it is also the great challenge to us upon whom rests the responsibility of awakening the public to the new trends. Let us no longer be content just to tell what is happening; let us use our imagination, vision, and faith to blaze new trails and *tell what can* happen. Let us accept our educational responsibility and grasp our professional opportunity. Let us make our jobs offices of public trust."[177]

Renegar's earlier survey revealing that much of industry would welcome closer cooperation with colleges on research problems had prompted convention discussions of the topic.

Speaking on "Education Looks to Business," President Herman Wells of Indiana University first emphasized the important role of ACPA members in bringing about greater cooperation with business and industry.

"You who are members of this Association," he asserted, "represent as do no others in your respective institutions the public approach to higher education. Your work consists of two important functions—the interpretation of your institutions to the public and the channeling to your institutions of public thought and reaction. In bringing about a common understanding between education and industry you help to join in cooperative effort the two most important forces in American life."[178]

In his bill of particulars, Wells said that education was coming to industry first "with an appeal for support not only to do the job better, but for support in order that the present job can be continued." Secondly, he said, education "would have business join with it in the creation and maintenance of a continuously-favorable educational 'climate'. . . . We believe that business should protect the right of university faculties to examine and reexamine every scientific premise and social institution."

Wells also asked that industry define, as far as possible, the abilities, capacities, knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for various kinds of employment; give cooperation in encouraging key businessmen to serve as consultants and part-time instructors at the high school, evening school, and university levels, and furnish opportunity to provide professionally-trained men and women to assist in training.

"The future of education depends on the support of business and industry," Wells concluded. "The future of business is no less dependent on education. This is the challenge of cooperation. Together, business and education as partners can build a better trained, more productive, and prosperous America."[179]

Paul Blazer, chairman of the board of Ashland Oil and Refining Company, told the delegates that industry looks to education "to furnish brilliant scientists and technologists and to supply the talent for wise, enlightened industrial management; . . . to overcome in the younger generation the defects of character and training which account for the confusion and strife we see all about us today."

"Many kinds of education are needed, but more than anything else we need education for citizenship," Blazer said. "Advancement in scientific knowledge without corresponding advancement in character constitutes a danger which conceivably could destroy our civilization. Our teaching profession affords the most promising corrective instrumentality."[180]

Norman P. Auburn, University of Cincinnati vice president who had also served publicity and public relations stints with industry and federal government, gave the delegates a thought-provoking address called "What the Administration Expects of a Public Relations Office."

"The point I wish to make at the outset of this discussion," declared Auburn, who later would serve as president of the University of Akron for twenty-one years, "is that I am convinced that the public relations officer should have a position in the administration which entitles him to voice his opinion of the probable public reaction to projected changes in educational policy, new developments, student relationships, etc. When industry considers the adoption of a new product, it looks to its market research department for guidance. In a sense, the university public relations officer is the market researcher for the university. And he must be more sensitive to the public reaction than his colleagues in industry inasmuch as colleges and universities . . . are vitally dependent upon favorable public relations."

Auburn then said that the administration expects his publicity director "to carry on these vital activities during these critical days: (1) explain the university's tremendous problems of educating veterans . . . ; (2) perform a sensible job of interpreting the college's problems to the veterans themselves; (3) provide a reasonable explanation of the college's financial problems . . . ; (4) be honestly aggressive as the mouthpiece of the college . . . ; (5) break down the common impression of the prominence of 'razzle-dazzle' in college life . . . ; (6) help in breaking down the growing idea that colleges are the cradle of the lunatic fringe in America . . . ; (7) publicize increasingly the fact that education and business have a great common task . . . ; (8) continue the fine work he has been doing in interpreting higher education to the country."[181]

Association officers anticipated that business before the convention would be heavy and consequently scheduled two sessions for consideration of items needing delegate decision. A third session eventually had to be sandwiched in on the final day of the convention.

The most important item on the docket was consideration of the revised constitution which had been presented to the membership in the March issue of *Publicity Problems* along with the new name, "American College Public Relations Association." Once the articles on name and purpose had been approved, the delegates voted unanimously to adopt the constitution as revised by the Constitution Committee and amended by the Executive Committee.

As revised, the general purpose of the Association would be to unite those persons interested in *any and all phases* of public relations activities of colleges and universities in the United States, its territories, Canada, and Latin America. The basic objectives were to include the continuous development as well as the maintenance of high standards in the educational public relations field and the advancement of higher education in general.

The new constitution also provided that each institution, in addition to its primary or voting membership, could have as many secondary or nonvoting memberships as it wished. Dues for secondary members were set at $5. Those for individual members not affiliated with an educational institution, like those of primary members, were to be $10. Honorary members were not to pay dues. The revised constitution reduced the number of vice presidencies to five by dropping that for women's activities and provided for two official publications, a monthly (September or October through June, inclusive) to be known as *College Public Relations*, and a volume titled *College Public Relations Annual* to be devoted to the proceedings of the annual convention.[182]

Reports by the Plans and Policies Committee occupied a considerable amount of time in business sessions. The suggestions received by the committee had been boiled down to ten mimeographed pages and placed in the hands of delegates at registration time. When the committee, following a discussion meeting on the first day of the convention, brought in a report recommending fourteen goals for 1946-47, it was adopted unanimously.

The establishment of a central office, "recognized as essential if the Association is to give to members and to higher education the service within its power," was accepted as the major project of the Association for 1946-47. The recommendation called for the Association, pending establishment of the central office, to employ a full-time assistant in the secretary-treasurer's office to help handle the heavy work load, at a salary not to exceed $2,500.

Other major recommendations called for consultation with other associations in public relations work and higher education to secure increased background for a new Standards of Practice for the Association; investigation of opportunities for expanding research projects through cooperation with the nation's graduate schools and other organizations; expansion of the placement service with a fee for nonmenbers; cooperation with colleges and universities in drawing up courses of study for the training of public relations people; greater emphasis on district conventions, where possible in conjunction with regional meetings of the American Alumni Council; added emphasis on the slogan, "United in the Service of Higher Education"; special consideration of the ten typewritten pages of suggestions received from members for improving national conventions; similar study of the suggestions received for improving the Association's magazine; and a study which would provide the basis for a definite policy on awards meant to serve the membership and all higher education more effectively. The committee's recommendations were accompanied with suggestions on steps which could be taken to assure implementation.

The Association, which had rarely taken note of political affairs in its first twenty-eight years, passed resolutions expressing concern about two such matters at Lexington. One urged United States membership in the United Nations. The other called for American colleges to encourage "in keeping with our government's policy of developing good will and amity among all peoples as the basis for a lasting peace," every worthy endeavor which aims to promote better racial and religious understanding and cooperation.[183]

Four awards and three honorary memberships recommended by the Awards Committee were conferred at the convention banquet. Howard W. Blakeslee, science editor of the Associated Press, received the citation for distinguished service in the interpretation of education by a nonmember "as a pioneer who has led the way to a nationwide appreciation of the achievements in the laboratories of the nation's institutions of higher education." The award for distinguished service by a member went to John P. DeCamp of the University of Cincinnati, an Association leader in many capacities since 1927. The citation for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of education by a member was awarded to Harold Ellis of the University of California, and the Helms Foundation Award for outstanding achievement in sports publicity went to Joe Sherman of Clemson College. Recipients of honorary life memberships were Earl Reed Silvers, dean of men at Rutgers University and former ACPA president, and William G. Avirett and Benjamin Fine, education editors of the New York *Herald Tribune* and New York *Times*, respectively.[184]

Upon the recommendation of the Nominating Committee composed of nine past presidents in attendance, the convention elected the following officers for 1946-47: President, Harold K. Schellenger, Ohio State University; vice presidents, W. Henry Johnston, Colgate University, membership; E. Ross Bartley, Indiana University, research; Horace Renegar, Tulane University, regions; Elmer G. Sulzer, University of Kentucky, radio; and William Wranek, Jr., University of Virginia, athletics; secretary-treasurer, Max E. Hannum, Carnegie Institute of Technology; editor, Lorena Drummond, Southern Illinois Normal University; associate editor, Paul Faris, Hendrix College; and business manager, Roy Wilson, U. S. Office of Education, now back from service in the Navy. Shortly after the convention, Hannum resigned his post at Carnegie Tech to become assistant to the president at Franklin and Marshall. The convention authorized the Executive Committee to select the 1947 convention city. St. Louis was the choice with William A. Durbin of St. Louis University as convention secretary.[185]

Following up on recommendations of the Plans and Policies Committee, the Executive Committee authorized the secretary-treasurer-elect to employ an assistant as of September 1, but decided the salary should not exceed $1,500 a year. And for the first time in Association history, it voted to give its endorsement to a non-Association publication, Reck's *Public Relations: A Program for Colleges and Universities*.[186] Published by Harper and Brothers three months later, the book was also endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the American Council on Public Relations.

When the *College Public Relations Annual* was published in early fall, Secretary-Treasurer Bartley's report showed that membership had climbed to 518 and that the Association's net worth stood at $5,405, more than three times that of the same date in 1944.[187]

Although the Association was handicapped by wartime conditions much of the time, the biennium during which it was led by Arthur Brandon can be considered as the most significant in its first fifty years. Culmination of the shift of interest from publicity to public relations, development of effective relationships with other professional groups, completion of the long-time plans and policies study, achievement of the strongest financial condition in the Association's history to date, procurement of the first major grant for the Association's work, establishment of a counseling system on public relations for colleges and universities, further development of public relations seminars, completion of research programs which strengthened ties with business and industry, continuance of *Publicity Problems* as a quality magazine despite increasing costs, expansion of general services to members, and increasing recognition for the Association, its activities, and contributions can be recorded among the major achievements of 1944-46.

6

Evolution of a National Office

A Modest First Step

Persons given to alliteration back in 1946-47 might well have referred to Harold Schellenger as ACPRA's peripatetic president.

Early in his presidency, Schellenger realized that a national president had seldom attended a district meeting other than his own. He consequently decided to attend every district meeting possible and succeeded in attending ten of fourteen. In addition, the ACPRA president, indefatigable in his dedication to the job of making public relations understood and appreciated, ranged far and wide to address such diverse groups as the American Association of Teachers Colleges in Atlantic City, agricultural extention workers in North Dakota and Indiana, a church conference in St. Louis, and a conference called by the U. S. Office of Education in Washington. In giving more than fifty talks [he abhorred the "high-sounding" word addresses] during the year, he also appeared before college faculties, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, real estate boards, and farm bureaus. To meet engagements which called for him to give as many as six talks in five days, the ACPRA president logged by train, plane, and bus total mileage in excess of the 25,000—which could have taken him once around the world.[1]

Schellenger's speaking trips left him with memories of experiences unique among those of Association presidents. Reminiscing two decades later, he recalled that there had been amusing as well as nerve-wracking moments during his travels.

"On one occasion," he recalled, "I was asked to go to St. Louis as a consultant for a meeting of the National Board of Education of the African M. E. Zionist Church. I expected the usual setting of members sitting around a table and asking me questions. When I got to the church, I found this was not the case. The board had decided, without telling me until fifteen minutes before the event, that this was to be a full-fledged church service *with me as the preacher*. I thought if they could take it, I could too! Accordingly, I was in the processional with two robed choirs and six or eight bishops in vestments. That was an experience I will never forget!"[2]

Another experience Schellenger never forgot took place when he attended a district meeting in the Southwest. No one had given him a program and not until the district director made the opening announcements did Schellenger know that he was being expected to provide the day's entire program. Starting with nothing except the notes for the talk he had been expecting to give, the ACPRA president had to improvise for a whole day of brainstorming.

After Schellenger on another occasion had presented five forty-five minutes talks within twenty-four hours on a state college campus, some of the faculty members thought that a bit of relaxation was in order. They suggested a good bottle of wine as the answer. "This presented a problem," Schellenger recalled. "The president of this state school was bitterly opposed to the use or purchase of alcoholic beverages by any of his faculty. To meet the problem, state school faculty members called a friend on the faculty of a nearby Methodist school whose president had no such hidebound views, and the good Methodist cheerfully went to the liquor store to purchase the wine for our party."[3]

One of President Schellenger's larger concerns was the fact that the meaning and scope of public relations were so little understood by college presidents who, in the final analysis, were the top public relations persons at their institutions.

In the depths of World War II, Schellenger, as chairman of the Association's Public Relations Committee, had had occasion to correspond with many colleges. Often he found the same sentence in their replies: "We don't have *enough* students on our campus these days to be concerned about our public relations."

After his election to the ACPRA presidency, Schellenger once again was in correspondence with a large number of college administrators—still urging that institutional public relations was deserving of more attention and support than it usually recieved. Now Schellenger was dismayed by the fact that replies included sentences like these: "We have *too many* students these days to be thinking about public relations. We must devote our time and attention to *more immediate* problems."[4]

"The college president still is, unintentionally, the greatest single obstacle to a better understanding and support of the important work of the colleges and universities," Schellenger wrote six months after his election. "True, there are exceptions—may they increase! But by and large, the subject of public relations is still one, in the presidential mind, which is not worthy of the same administrative attention which goes to curriculum, testing and guidance, faculty salaries, even building programs."

Happily, a president was converted once in awhile, Schellenger reported. He quoted from a letter he had received from a top administrator who had been much impressed with the thought, "Good public relations, like charity, begins at home," emphasized by Schellenger and other speakers during an ACPRA seminar she had attended. She had written Skelly thus:

"The first thing I did when I returned to the office was dig out of the pile a memorandum which a faculty member had presented to me some weeks before. It hadn't seemed important at the time, so I had put it aside for attention at some future time. After attending the public relations meeting, I realized that the matter may not have been important to me but it was to the individual who had presented it. My neglect, I now understood, had been no good contribution to my faculty morale.

"Then, later in the day, I heard that one of our maintenance workers had been injured. At the risk of causing the poor fellow to die of shock, I visited him at home. He survived, however, and his gratitude was overwhelming.

"As I closed my desk at the end of that day, I had more happiness and more satisfaction than I had experienced in months. And at the same time I knew I had done much good for the public relations of my college."

Schellenger advised ACPRA's membership that the encouragement of college administrators to give more than lip service to public relations was a subject worthy of the Association's attention. Furthermore, he promised that it would received considerable attention during 1946-47 from the Association's Public Relations Committee. He also suggested that those members in a position to do so urge college administrations to devote time to the subject of public relations at their state, regional, and national meetings.

"Our motive is not selfish, either as an association or as individual public relations workers," he emphasized. "Rather, we are very much like the physician who urges upon his patient the need for giving thought and attention to his own health that he may lead a longer and more useful life."[5]

Month after month in his column in *College Public Relations* (formerly *Publicity Problems*), as in his half a hundred speeches, Schellenger drummed away at the task of awakening colleges and college administrators to the meaning and benefits of public relations. At he same time, and with equal consistency, he endeavored to develop in ACPRA's growing membership greater understanding of their individual and collective tasks, plus increased pride in the opportunities unfolding.

"We still must sell higher education generally on the idea that good public relations is a way of life, to be practiced every day, in season and out," he wrote in midyear. "We have yet to overcome the belief which is all too prevalent that a concern for public relations is needed only in connection with a financial campaign or an appeal for legislative appropriations or a drive for students.

"The American College Public Relations Association," continued the president in that same column, "carries a major responsibility in the world of higher education today. It is the only organization dedicated wholeheartedly to a better understanding and a better support of the colleges and universities. It is one of the few associations which cut across all divisional lines to bring together in a common membership representatives of public-supported and private schools; the largest universities and the smallest colleges; state and denominational; liberal arts and technological.

"Yet with such an important mission and such a comprehensive program, ACPRA still is something of a 'fringe' organization in educational circles. . . . But recognition for ACPRA and its role must come in two ways. First, we acknowledge the responsibility of the national officers, and those who serve in these capacities pledge their best within the limits of their talents and time. But, second, there is the obligation of the individual public relations and publicity directors in all parts of the country. Their responsibility and their opportunity are even greater than that of the national officers.

"What educational administrators, in their national and regional groups, think of public relations and its meaning to higher education will depend very largely on what individual administrators think of the directors of their individual institutions. All of us are too prone to generalize, and the president and the faculty of one college are likely to think that the public relations workers in all other institutions are like the individual serving that particular school. Thus it is that every public relations director in the nation has a stake in the work and achievements of *every other* director in the land. The director who increases his stature in his particular job is raising the level of his profession, and increasing its opportunities for usefulness.

"I have every confidence that the American College Public Relations Association some day—and it may not be many years—will achieve a position of eminence in the world which will be universally recognized. When that day comes, higher education itself will have achieved a place of greater esteem and greater support. This recognition of ACPRA will be inseparable from a new appreciation of all for which the Association stands and for which its officers and its members constantly are working."[6]

The emphasis given to propaganda, publicity, and public relations by government during the war years and the new attacks being mounted on colleges and universities—in the main because the general public did not understand the problems resulting as the flood of veterans inundated facilities and faculties—were leading institutions by the dozen to affiliate with ACPRA for the first time. Most representatives of these institutions were young and most of them were new to the profession. Seeking to help these newcomers build their careers on solid foundations and at the same time bring strength to ACPRA in its broader objectives, older members of the Association wrote perceptive articles for *College Public Relations*.

"It is a good sign that college presidents, trustees, and faculty are recognizing that the counsel of public relations officers is as essential in their field as that of specialists in architecture, law, and business in their areas or of deans on educational policies," wrote Arthur Brandon, the immediate past president. "Public relations, however, is one of the newer offices, and the directions it shall take are now being surveyed. The crossroads lie just ahead. The traffic light is showing amber, which means that we must proceed with caution. Fortunately, there is no dead end in sight.

"Where will our road lead? As with any tourist, it depends on the directions we choose, the vehicle we are riding in, and what other drivers are doing. Because the crossroads lie ahead we are forward-looking, but perhaps if we consider briefly some of the places we have been we can know better which way to go."

After sketching the history and goals of ACPRA's predecessor organizations, the American Association of College News Bureaus and the American College Publicity Association, Brandon continued:

"In the very act of giving out information on the colleges and interpreting their needs, accomplishments, and objectives the publicity officers were enlisting the interest of more and more people. This was desirable and possible because the colleges were opening their doors to an enlarging clientele. . . . This expanding educational policy was led by the administrators; the publicity director reported it. The two-way relationship between college and public was becoming so extensive, and so important, that the president and other administrators could not keep abreast of the new needs without neglecting other important matters. It was natural for them to turn to the publicity people who had helped develop this public interest for counsel and aid in merging the community and campus in matters of common concern. And so came about organized public relations. . . .

"In arriving at the approach to the crossroads let us remember that as we expanded from a news to a publicity profession, press relations lost none of their importance; and as we shift from publicity to public relations, publicity values are in no way lessened. We are merely adding to our equipment whatever will increase our effectiveness as we anticipate the large journey.

"It is well at this point to recall that publicity may be both good and bad, and so also public relations. Publicity is like reputation—what the public learns about you; public relations is like character—what you really are. The whole personality of an institution in its many parts and personnel affects the public's attitude toward it. And public relations is a *fait accompli*—the relationship *exists*. It is the privilege of the public relations officer to see that that relationship is a happy one."

Brandon emphasized that the public relations program must be tailored for each college, that there was no one-two-three formula for setting it up and selling it to the president and governing officials.

"Of course," he said, "there are basic principles and absolute requirements common to all public relations activity, such as worthy overall action, the maintenance of an information and interpretation program, and the practice of techniques that are acceptable within your area. It should be recognized that public relations is a coordinated and not an individual responsibility and that an organized department is not an operating agency in the sense that a business office is, but is rather an office for correlating certain activities of many divisions. . . .

"Responsibilities of the public relations director it might be concluded are of three types. He is: (1) a director, (2) a coordinator, (3) an adviser. . . . Part of the public relations officer's educational duties should be to find more and more groups to which the college's offerings may be extended. . . . An awareness of the public's increasing interest in specialized training and of the newer methods of satisfying this urge is part of the equipment of the alert public relations director. . . .

"*Public service* may be an even more inclusive or appropriate term than public relations for the activities of the public relations director. In this area are included many of the small tasks which have such tremendous accumulative value in long-range public relations success. To fail to attend to them is to counteract the values of other acts which on the surface may seem to carry more weight. . . . Without the skillful use of the techniques and media of dispensing information, [however], the planning and service of a department are of small avail. Here we should keep abreast of the latest methods of public appeal; we should make use of opinion and attitude surveys; we should observe fresh experiments in news approach. . . . In the broader field of public relations we must continually remind ourselves that publicity is its voice. . . .

"But the public relations road ahead will require more than an informed public for safe passage. We must not only tell a good story; we must live a good life. What we *do* will speak louder than what we *say*."[7]

In the same issue with Brandon's article, "Public Relations Crossroads Ahead," *Col-*

lege Public Relations included another article emphasizing the broad scope of public relations, this one by Emerson Reck. *School and Society*, a journal read by many college presidents, later carried this article which emphasized public relations as a way of life for an institution and its people. Introducing his article on *"Public Relations: A Team Job"* with three brief paragraphs, the writer said:

"The public relations of any institution, i.e. the measure of its prestige, is the sum of all the impressions people have regarding the institution.

"The impressions which people have of an institution are created by the various individuals and groups associated with it.

"Public Relations is therefore a way of life for all the individuals and groups associated with an institution, not just the job of a single person."

In concluding the article which emphasized how impressions are made and included a chart to show public relations at work, Reck said:

"Only when trustees, staff members, students, and alumni do appreciate their place will they consider their own words, acts, and attitudes important in the sensitive process of earning and retaining public confindence.

"It is here that the public relations director can play his largest role. If he knows his job and has the confidence of those associated with the institution, he can, through counsel, suggestion, and example, show the way to improved team work. His job, and the job of every person on the team, calls for a deep interest in people and an understanding of the problems they face; it calls for an equally deep interest in higher education and in the institution of which the team is a part. Moreover, it calls for alertness, imagination, and resourcefulness, linked closely with purpose, confidence, and patience, but, above all, it calls for human understanding coupled with common sense and good judgment."[8]

In recognition of the Association's—and the magazine's—new name, Editor Lorena Drummond endeavored to broaden the content of *College Public Relations*. Covered at one time or another were such activities as relationships with administrators, policy making, fund raising, community and regional services, conferences and special events, alumni relations, student publications, radio, television, and motion pictures. Because the need for greater financial support was becoming critical to colleges and universities faced with bulging enrollments, an article on "Public Relations in Fund Raising" was hailed by readers of *College Public Relations* as one of the year's most valuable.

Author of the article, which included the highlights of an address given in the preceding summer at a seminar on public relations co-sponsored by ACPRA at Syracuse University, was Arnaud C. Marts, president and senior partner of the pioneer public relations and fund-raising firm, Marts and Lundy.

"Public relations has the same relation to fund raising that planting and cultivating have to harvesting," Marts asserted. "Public relations must plant ideas in the minds and spirits of men and women, must nourish and stimulate friendly impulses and attitudes, and must create conditions and circumstances in which these ideas, impulses, and attitudes shall burgeon into the full harvest of generosity.

"I think it is fair to say, therefore, that a comprehensive program of public relations is essential to successful fund raising and must precede fund raising and surround it in point of time and space in every direction. Fund raising for a college is one of the two or three supreme measures or tests of its successful public relations. . . .

"The long-term program of public relations as it relates to fund raising should," Marts continued, "be a most comprehensive and far-reaching program aimed at providing broad and deep foundations of public knowledge and public approval of the college. Such a comprehensive long-term program of public relations should be directed toward all the 'publics' of the college. . . .

"Frequently, in our preliminary fund-raising survey for a college, we find potential giving ability amongst alumni, local citizens, and trustees, but an apathy or lack of appreciation or understanding of the college's needs. This situation, of course, results from an inadequate public relations program over the preceding ten years."[9]

After emphasizing the need for balance in the public relations program and ways of cultivating the college's various publics, Marts concluded by saying, "I will wind up this discussion by repeating my opening sentence: Public relations has the same relation to fund raising that planting and cultivating have to harvesting. As President Cunningham of Davidson College said to us recently: 'Some college presidents seem to think that they can hitch the reaper right behind the plow!' "[10]

Activities and services of some ACPRA officers and committees were enlarged as a result of a meeting of the Association's Executive Committee held in early December. The committee voted to extend to the National Education Association an offer of cooperation in promoting American Education Week, authorized the president to appoint a Publications Board which would provide technical and editorial assistance to the editors of *College Public Relations* and *College Public Relations Annual*, fixed fees for the Placement Service, voted to establish a committee to study sports broadcasting practices among colleges and universities, and authorized the study of several constitutional matters, including the classification system for Association memberships.[11]

John DeCamp, chairman of the Public Relations Committee, was able to report in April that the sponsors of American Education Week had welcomed ACPRA's offer of cooperation in promoting the seven-day program scheduled for the following November. They had also given Association representatives opportunity to help in selecting the general theme and the topics chosen for emphasis on each of the seven days.[12]

The registration fee was set at $2 for the Placement Service, now formally organized as a result of action taken at the Lexington convention. Anyone getting an appointment through the service would also pay one percent of his first year's salary within six months after assuming his new duties. The report of the secretary-treasurer for 1946-47 later revealed that the costs for getting the service underway, largely for the printing of forms and mailing of announcement cards to presidents, were much more than the returns for the year.[13] However, the response from college administrators had been good and the Association had finally given permanent status to a service which had operated on an "on again, off again" basis since it was first introduced under a committee some twenty-five years earlier.

The Publications Board, resembling the one which had operated unofficially ten years earlier, was created at this time, not only to give technical and editorial assistance to the editors but also to provide continuity for Association publications in case the editors were unable to serve out their terms. Schellenger named nine persons to the board: H. L. Connelly, Wesleyan University; Harold E. Gibson, MacMurray College; Gertrude M. Hall, Illinois State Normal University; P. Caspar Harvey, William Jewell College; Robert L. Mossholder, University of Omaha; Francis Pray, Union College (New York); Emerson Reck, Colgate University; Hayden Weller, New York University; and Charles Widmayer, Dartmouth College.[14]

By this time "the wonders of television" were becoming a topic of conversation and the subject received attention at the District VI meeting during this year. The address of television consultant Richard Hubbell was printed in abbreviated form in *College Public Relations* to alert Association members to the challenges this new medium would certainly present.

"By its very nature television must be of importance to all colleges and universities," said Hubbell, "since they are concerned with all forms of human knowledge and human interests. For one thing, it is potentially the most powerful medium of public propaganda, of mass education, that the human mind has yet devised." Only six universities as of the time of Hubbell's address had made plans to build their own television stations and three of these were located west of the Mississippi.[15]

The March issue of *College Public Relations* carried startling news: President Schellenger had resigned as director of public relations at Ohio State University effective April 1 to become director of the seven-man Public Relations Department at Byer and Bowman, an advertising agency in Columbus. He planned, however, to serve out his term with ACPRA, including participation in three district meetings still to be held.

Delegates at the Lexington convention had authorized the Executive Committee to select the 1947 convention city and St. Louis had been its choice, with May 14-17 as the dates. Convention Secretary William A. Durbin of St. Louis University began in February to provide information on the program to the membership. The theme, he said, would be "a practical approach to the down-to-earth problems of public relations, with a carefully-planned examination of objectives and methods." A special program designed for new members, small discussion groups for members with special interests, and a problems clinic were among features Durbin promised. Almost 300 delegates attended the convention to make it the largest by far the Association had held.

Arthur Brandon, the "first statesman of ACPRA," delivered the keynote address, his second at an Association convention in eight years. His subject this time was "Reselling Education."

To help his listeners think of their jobs in broad terms "on this occasion when there are so many members attending their first national conference, and all of us are in a way just getting started into organized public relations work," Brandon turned to the *Dictionary of Sociology* for a description of public relations work and workers which he adapted for his college audience:

"Relations of a college or university or [of] the individuals or organizations connected with it [are relations] with the publics which must be taken into consideration in carrying on educational and social functions. These publics include students, teachers, and all other staff personnel; alumni, parents, legislators, and church bodies; other schools and colleges, prospective students, and donors and any group or individual with whom the institution comes in contact. The body of theory and technique utilized in adjusting the relationship of a college with its publics is important. These theories and techniques represent applications of sociology, social psychology, economics, and political science, as well as the special skills of journalists, artists, organizational experts, advertising men, etc., to the specific problems involved in this field of activity. . . .

"A specialist in public relations [is], specifically, an expert in analyzing public relations maladjustments; locating probable causes of such maladjustments in the social behavior of the college and its personnel, and in the sentiments and opinions of the public; and advising the client on suitable corrective measures. The latter requires 'bedside' techniques, as delicate and complex as those utilized by the psychiatrist in many cases. The public relations counselor has a field of competence that overlaps somewhat those of press agents, public opinion analysts, lobbyists, organizational experts, etc., and requires him to be in a broad sense a societal technician, proficient in the application of scientific social theories and tested publicity techniques."

The problem confronting higher education as of the moment, Brandon said, boiled down to "how to procure facilities and personnel for the increased college population, or in public relations terms, how more effectively to tell the story of higher education so the general public, which in the end supplies the incentive and the money for expansion, will comprehend present and future needs. The worth of education," Brandon added, "is established; the price of education is not so well understood."[16]

Except for Brandon's keynote address, formal speeches were heard only at luncheons and dinners during the three-day convention. Twelve panel discussions, one of them for beginners and the others on a wide variety of subjects such as "Educational Public Relations in Action," "Public Relations Problems," and "Public Relations for Scientific Research," took up much of the three days. Special breakfasts occupied delegates for an hour-and-a-half each morning with representatives from the various denominational colleges, junior colleges, and teachers colleges breaking into six groups while district directors and sports information directors were also meeting. Educational television had a place on a national convention program for the first time when St. Louis Station KSD-TV and St. Louis University cooperated on a half-hour demonstration. The major event for relaxation was a performance of an old-time melodrama, "The Hatfields and the McCoys," aboard the showboat, *Goldenrod*, which had been chartered for an evening on the Mississippi.[17]

Douglass Miller, who had directed seminars which ACPRA co-sponsored at Syracuse University in the summers of 1944, 1945, and 1946, chaired the featured panel called "Educational Public Relations in Action."

"The basic objectives common to all public relations programs are three-fold," he asserted. "The first is a knowledge of public opinion and public attitude concerning the institutions for which we are seeking to shape public relations. This involves acquaintance with the attitudes of each of the various publics with which the institution is concerned. The first objective seeks to construct one side of the two-way street this public relations must be. It realizes the objective of bringing a knowledge of the public to the institution.

"The second objective is to shape policy in view of the knowledge of public attitude which has been gained so the interests of the various publics will be served by the institution to the maximum degree. This is the *doing* part that we have in mind when we say with respect to public relations that doing is more important than saying.

"The third and final basic objective of the public relations program is to inform the public of the various adjusted policies that have been achieved in the public interest. This is generally regarded as the *saying* phase of the program."[18]

Tying in with the panel discussion on "Educational Public Relations in Action" was an address on "A Look at Industrial Public Relations" by Thomas J. Ross of the New York-based pubic relations firm of Ivy Lee and Ross. Speaking at the first dinner meeting, Ross said:

"One of the tasks of those who engage in this interesting work is to make continuingly clear to those who have the responsibility for making decisions that the policy of the institutions is of first importance, and that if the policy is sound public relations, the publicity in the hands of good technicians will largely take care of itself. . . .

"Thus, the first task of anyone concerned with the public relations of an industry is to look not outside to the making of statements to the public, but inside to what is done and the way it is done; to the attitude of the man at the top and the influence of his personality on the business. Only with a sound policy established and followed can publicity function successfully in interpreting business to the public.

"And why does industry bother with all this? Because increasingly it is found that public opinion, favorable or unfavorable, influences the climate in which its affairs are conducted. It has been appropriately said that public opinion, like the pressure of the atomosphere, is always with us.

"Public relations being a management function, a policy-level function, the best way to further its proper understanding and development and to encourage its effective practice is for public relations personnel to be accepted as members of the management group. Then, through familiarity with what is going on, they are in a position to perform their two most important jobs: (1) to be consulted as to the public relations aspects of matters under discussion in their formative stages, and (2) to initiate things that will help the company in its contacts with the public.

"In a manufacturing industry, public relations begins with the integrity of the product; in a public utility with the quality of its service. The objective of both is favorable public opinion—satisfied customers, employers, stockholders, and other groups of the public whose patronage or attitude may determine the success or failure of the enterprise."[19]

ACPRA at the St. Louis convention was observing the thirtieth anniversary of its founding and President Schellenger gave the anniversary address.

Schellenger earlier had said, "It has been our purpose to increase the stature of the Association, winning for it greater respect among educators and administrators; to encourage among members a higher sense of personal responsibility; to make the workings of our organization more efficient along many lines."[20] Now he was able to say that the organization's goals had been met one by one.

"All of these evidences of progress and stature for ACPRA are causes for satisfaction, but not for gloating," he declared. "They only serve to emphasize the greater responsibility which is ours as we start another decade tonight. It seems to me that ACPRA will find its greatest usefulness as a service organization. . . .

"It would be a real achievement for ACPRA if somehow this organization could inspire in colleges throughout the land the willingness to bring together administrative and faculty leaders of each institution to put under the microscope every college activity for a study of its public relations aspects. It is high time that education subjected itself to this type of critical examination. If it does not, the public will and slow death will await those institutions found wanting. . . .

"In the past we have been too prone to think of public relations merely as a means for promoting each school's selfish interests. Actually every college has a stake in the conduct, character, and reputation of every other college, as has already been partially recognized in accrediting associations. Few people ever come to know well more than one institution, and it follows naturally that they will judge all of higher education on the basis of experience with that one school. So long as there is one college anywhere which is indifferent to its public relations and its public responsibilities, all of our schools will be the losers thereby. Here again, we are our brother's keeper!"[21]

In a number of ways 1946-47 was a year of firsts and new records for the Association. Establishment of secondary memberships by the 1946 convention encouraged many institutions to enroll more than one representative and the number of individuals on the roster increased almost forty-one percent to 729. Now the roll included colleges from Canada, the Dominican Republic, Hawaii, Mexico, and Puerto Rico as well as every state in the United States and the District of Columbia.[22]

Rates for advertising in the Association magazine had been increased, yet the billings jumped almost 100 percent from $623 for displays for eight advertisers in 1945-46 to $1,221 for advertisements by sixteen firms and individuals in 1946-47. Total receipts also reached a new high of $7,131, up from $6,863 the year before when the figure included the $1,000 grant from Marts and Lundy for use later in helping finance the publicity manual.[23]

Secretary-Treasurer Max Hannum reported at the St. Louis convention that he had been able to make a modest start toward establishment of the long-talked-about central office. He had, however, been able to get by with an expenditure of $574.23 for secretarial help rather than the $1,500 authorized at Lexington. Ten persons had worked in the "central office" as an adjunct of his office but, he said, "Many services were contributed; others were paid for at extremely low figures."[24]

The prestige of the Association was growing indeed. The number of requests for addresses by officers and other Association leaders had increased. The Association had for the first time been invited to send representatives to college inaugurations. Conferences on public relations had been scheduled in four states with ACPRA members as leaders and the number of national organizations calling on the Association for consultation and for public relations projects had increased.

The Association indicated willingness to carry its joint efforts even further. It included among nine resolutions adopted at St. Louis one reaffirming its desire "to cooperate with individuals and groups engaged in public relations work with a view toward enlarging its own perspective as well as transmitting the findings of our Association's experience and research." This resolution included a request that the officers "devise means for implementing this program through exchange of publications, fraternal delegates, research, and participation in conferences."[25]

The Plans and Policies Committee emphasized again that the establishment of a central office should be made the Association's principal objective during the year ahead. To put the Association in a better position to achieve this goal the convention delegates authorized the Executive Committee to take a mail vote on a proposal to raise dues to $15 for primary, business and personal memberships, and $7.50 for secondary memberships.[26]

Six awards were conferred by the Association at the thirtieth anniversary dinner. They went to William G. Avirett, education editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, for distinguished service in the interpretation of higher education; to Arthur L. Brandon of the University of Michigan for distinguished and unselfish service to the Association; to Emerson Reck of Colgate University for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of education; to Donald E. Phillips of the University of Arizona the Helms Foundation Award for outstanding achievement in sports publicity; to Theodore T. Frankenberg, founder of the Association, for unselfish service to the organization; and to RKO-Pathe pictures for distinguished service in the interpretation of higher education through motion pictures. In recognition of his services over a long period of time, the Association voted an honorary life membership to retiring President Schellenger.[27]

Horace Renegar of Tulane University was elected president of the Association to succeed Schellenger. Other officers elected were: secretary-treasurer, Max E. Hannum, Carnegie Tech; vice presidents, W. Henry Johnston, Colgate, membership; C. A. Serenius, Augustana College, research; Medora M. Mason, Fairmont (West Virginia) State College, regions; William A. Durbin, St. Louis University, radio; and Robert Cook, Indiana University, athletics; editor, *College Public Relations*, Francis C. Pray, Union College (New York); business manager, Roy K. Wilson, National Education Association, reelected; editor, *College Public Relations Annual*, Bradford D. Ansley, Emory University, for 1947 and Max Milbourn, University of Wichita, for 1948; Publications Advisory Board, Lorena Drummond, Southern Illinois State University; Edward P. VonderHaar, Xavier University; and Robert L. Mossholder, Omaha University.[28] Serenius and Durbin resigned their offices early in the 1947-48 year. No one was named to succeed the former in the research job, but Elmer Sulzer, former vice president for radio, was appointed to succeed Durbin.

Denver was selected as the site for the 1948 convention and Edward D. Whittlesey, the Association's president in 1943-44 and now director of public relations at the University of Denver, was named convention secretary. June 23-25 were approved as convention dates.[29]

In his final column of the year published in *College Public Relations* for June, President Schellenger sounded a challenge for the future when he said: "Few can realize as fully as your retiring officers that ACPRA, despite its thirty years, is still 'young'. It has gone far beyond the vision of its founders, yet it still has far, very far, to go. The opportunities, the challenges, which our Association faces, as its members stand 'United in the Service of Education', are unlimited. Our contribution to education in the years ahead will be limited only by our vision and our determination. I have no doubt that long before its semicentennial, ACPRA will have won the place it deserves among the great educational organizations of the nation."[30]

Year of the New Horizon

J. A. R. Pimlott of Wimbledon, England, spent 1947-48 in the United States as a Home Civil Service Commonwealth Fellow doing research on the emergence and development of public relations as an American phenomenon. When he published his findings in 1951 under the title, *Public Relations and American Democracy*, he described the American College Public Relations Association as the most important organization in the field of "specialist associations."

The British scholar drew his conclusion on the basis of a study started little more than a year after ACPRA had officially enlarged its area of activity to cover the whole field of educational public relations. He recognized, however, that the roots of the Association had been of a public relations character thirty years earlier when it was founded as the American Association of College News Bureaus. Pimlott's classification of the American College Public Relations Association as a "specialist association" was considered especially apt. The term, it was felt, was more descriptive than the professional terminology which often cited ACPRA as a "vertical association" in contrast to the "horizontal association" which included representatives of education, industry, government, business, and others among its members.[31]

Horace Renegar, ACPRA's president during the year Pimlott was making his study, was a man of wide experience both outside and inside the Association.

After seven years as a reporter and editor with the Associated Press, he became sports publicity director and assistant athletic director at Tulane in 1929. Later he served as athletic director and news bureau director before being appointed director of public relations in 1941. In ACPA-ACPRA he had been a vice president for five years, serving in the areas of athletics, membership, research, and regions.

Renegar was the living symbol of what one of his co-workers called "Positivistic Enthusiasm." "In describing Horace Renegar," wrote Quentin Ault, director of Tulane's news bureau when Renegar retired from the university's public relations post in 1966, "several phrases come to mind, phrases like effervescent, roly-poly, hospitable, lively, loyal, positive, professional, honest, humorous. Horace in action, and in deed, is a bubbly type. He effervesces when he talks, when he thinks, when he describes, when he argues, when he counsels, when he pleads a cause. This means that he is nearly always positive, very seldom negative. He has always bubbled over with enthusiasm for his university, for his profession, and for his client. This effervescence is what I call Horace Renegar—Positivistic Enthusiasm."[32]

Like others before and after him, Renegar found that the presidency produced amusing as well as serious experiences. In retrospect, he thought that his "funniest" occurred when he went to Salt Lake City for a district meeting.

Apologetically, the room clerk informed him that his room had not been serviced because the previous guests had just checked out. Renegar, wanting to look and feel his best when he gave his luncheon speech, rushed up to the unserviced room and stripped for a shower and shave.

In the midst of his shower he heard a baby cry, but could see nothing unusual when he hopped out for a peek. Then the phone rang and a faintly familiar voice asked, "Are you decent?" Thinking it was one of the delegates who had been on the train from Denver, he replied, "Give me five minutes."

As he hung up, Renegar saw a crib nearby and in it a baby kicking up his heels but making no noise. He rushed into his pants and shirt not a minute too soon. Answering a knock, he beheld a strange woman. Startled, she turned to leave but Renegar demanded, "Do you know whose baby this is?"

"My Lord!" exclaimed the woman, seeing the baby and rushing to pick him up. "Could they have forgotten the baby?"

Just then the phone rang and the woman's sister asked frantically if her baby was there. She had gone shopping, understanding that her husband would bring the baby to the parking lot when he checked out. He, however, had checked out, then forgotten to go back for the baby.

"Well, all's well that ends well," Renegar commented. "I was keyed up just right when I got to the luncheon, late again, but with a different story to tell and adorn."[33]

The year 1947-48 was marked by "positivistic enthusiasm." Renegar himself liked to describe it as "The Year of the New Horizon" because the emphasis of *College Public Relations*, the district meetings, and the 1948 national convention in Denver focused on that idea. "At least," said Renegar, "it was not found boring, for the large majority of the members were intrigued by the new ideas and opportunities which public relations in its fuller meaning opened for them."[34]

It was apparent from the first fall issue that *College Public Relations* would be much different from the magazine of past years which had featured articles by leaders in public relations, publicity and related fields, and occasionally one by a college president, dean, or professor. The new editor, Francis C. Pray, was a creative, imaginative individual who gave the magazine a new freshness. He introduced monthly symposia, each one concerning a major problem in educational public relations; a series of "posers" giving the viewpoints of ten or twelve specialists relative to some troublesome question asked by an Association member; and a news picture critique through which month after month members submitted photos for comment and criticism.

The symposia were built on eight problems which twenty-five past and present officers had listed for Pray as the ones they expected to be most serious, public relations-wise, during 1947-48. Pray in the first *College Public Relations* of the year listed the problems to be covered, invited comments of members, and indicated deadlines for receipt of material. Similar announcements in succeeding issues kept Pray well supplied with material on the following subjects touched in succession: (1) Cost of education—convincing the public that it is not excessive; (2) endowments—educating publics to the need for greater support; (3) admissions—explaining policy, shortages, etc.; (4) physical expansion—meeting shortages; (5) academic freedom—preparing to resist almost inevitable attacks on academic freedom in coming years; (6) faculty—improving faculty relations; (7) students—improving student-college relations. The problem of guiding education to greater usefulness in national and international spheres was to have been covered in an eighth symposium but was crowded out by a plethora of other material.[35]

ACPRA's vigilance and concerted concentration on the problems related to academic freedom, in Renegar's opinion, brought the Association its outstanding achievement of the year. After Pray announced that the symposium subject for April would be "Academic Freedom—Today, Tomorrow," readers submitted almost 20,000 words of material for possible use.

"The task of safeguarding academic freedom for America's colleges and universities is one of the challenging public relations problems of the postwar years," Pray said in his preface to the general discussion that month. "Today we have witch hunts, the criticisms of textbooks, the dragnet charges of 'communism', the holier-than-thou legislation that seeks to force education to teach those ideologies which have been approved as safe by the standpatters, the little minds, the fearful who cringe at night."[36]

Then, in more than six pages, with college presidents and directors of public relations or publicity sharing information and opinion, the symposium discussed "What is the danger?" "What is our responsibility?" "How serious is the problem?" "What is a reasonable college policy?" and "Where does it all end?" For those who were inclined to take the subject lightly, two pages were devoted to specific instances of harassment, pressures by service and women's clubs, smear tactics, and primitive legislation under the general head, "It Can't Happen Here! Who Says?"

Summing up, Editor Pray said: "First and foremost in the defense [of academic freedom] is a strong and enlightened college policy, a courageous president, and a board of trustees imbued with the conviction that the college must stand for freedom of expression within the framework of its enlightened policy. Then comes the administration of a positive public relations program. . . .

"American colleges already have public backing, sympathy, and support. The only danger is that they will listen longest to the attacks of the loudest and interpret criticism of their liberal programs as representative of public opinion. In almost every instance, wherever attack has come, and has been intelligently resisted, the college has won its case before the bar of public opinion. This means that public relations have been effective. It takes only courage to maintain them so."[37]

The warnings carried in the April symposium materials, along with the examples they presented of policies adopted and actions taken, were apparently helpful to ACPRA members generally. In the following months colleges and universities, with increased emphasis on interpretative effort, made clear their need to preserve the freedom to study and inquire. By 1950 what had threatened to become a trend toward an academic witch hunt had all but disappeared, thanks to many people at all levels.

Each of the "posers" featured in the magazine presented a sticky situation, then asked, "As director of public relations, what would you do?" Typical of the situations discussed were the following: "Immediately after your biggest football game you learn that your squad has thrown the contest as its only means of getting rid of the unpopular coach." "A student correspondent, appointed and paid by a newspaper, covers college news in a trivial or sensational manner, passes on rumors, promotes rash student statements, but stays within the letter of the rights granted a reporter." The feature was followed with avid interest because it gave members opportunity to pose unusual public relations situations and get the benefit of suggested solutions offered by specialists.

Two other regular features of the magazine grew from Pray's appointment, with Executive Committee approval, of four assistant editors. They included Alice B. Vosburgh of Smith College for women's interests, Howard S. Curtis of Brown University for personals, James F. Haughton of Villanova College for sports, and W. Lowell Treaster of Michigan State College for news pictures.

Treaster secured the cooperation of Wilbur Nelson of the Michigan State staff, and starting with its second issue *College Public Relations* carried each month Nelson's critique of three or more pictures submitted by members. On the basis of this feature ACPRA later in the year was cited by *Public Relations News*, the national weekly newsletter for professionals, as one of two groups "trying to do something to improve the quality of photographs that are used in public relations work."[38] For his part, Curtis started a section headed "What People Are Doing" which in most issues took over five pages of the magazine with items about fifty or more members.

The charge of the Plans and Policies Committee that a central office should be established in 1947-48 was implemented in modest fashion on September 1, 1947. At St. Louis the committee had stated that the business affairs of the Association could no longer be conducted in efficient fashion unless full-time assistance could be provided for the secretary-treasurer, then swamped under a mass of detail work conducted with ever-expanding membership and Association activities. With strong urging from President Schellenger the delegates had authorized a mail referendum to determine whether dues for 1947-48 should be increased to $15 for primary members to make possible the establishment of an elementary central office organization on a one-year trial basis. The vote for the dues increase had been overwhelming. As the new fiscal year started Marion French became the first regularly paid employee in ACPRA's history. Mrs. French, wife of Franklin and Marshall's alumni secretary, presided over a one-room office in the college's alumni headquarters and carried the title of office manager.

"It is a pleasure to report that ACPRA now owns its first piece of office equipment—a steel filing cabinet which is already bulging," Secretary-Treasurer Max Hannum reported in announcing Mrs. French's appointment. "Twenty crates of other ACPRA materials are stored nearby," he added.

Hannum also reported that the office had been open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and from 7 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. daily since September 1. Its first major task—invoicing for membership dues—had been completed, it had taken over the mailing of *College Public Relations* and it had started work on the Placement Service. "Seventy-four individuals are now enrolled with the service and contacts have been made for a majority of them," Hannum reported. "The service has definitely placed four people and has played a part in the placement of perhaps a dozen more".[39] Before the end of the fiscal year the number of registrants had grown to 105 and growing success in actual placement was reported.

Further implementing its slogan, "United in the Service of Higher Education," ACPRA in 1947-48 expanded its cooperative efforts with groups interested in education. Leaders of the Association worked with AAC and NEA as in recent years and worked also with the American Council on Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

As a result of Harold Schellenger's address before AACTE's convention in the spring of 1947, a joint committee of the two associations headed by Gertrude Hall of Illinois State Normal University had worked out a well-rounded program of public relations. Included were a workshop, a bulletin on public relations issued periodically, a publicity committee for AACTE projects, a manual on public relations for teacher education, and an informal service to provide counsel for member institutions of the teachers' group.[40]

With the broadened objectives ACPRA provided under its new name, interest in regional activities increased. For the second consecutive year every regional group held a meeting and it was estimated that more than ninety percent of the Association's members attended at least one district meeting. Presidents attended in increased numbers, many as program participants. Interest generated at regional meetings was believed accountable for the fact that 121 persons affiliated with ACPRA for the first time during 1947-48. Many of these were college presidents and the year's roster of members identified thirty-two as presidents.[41]

The continued interest of the Association of American Colleges and that of the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association was demonstrated by their endorsement of the Association's *College Publicity Manual* published by Harper and Brothers.

The manual was financed by the $1,000 grant pledged by Marts and Lundy in 1945 and an Executive Committee decision to subsidize the remaining cost. After two years of preparation it was completed during Renegar's administration and was distributed during the 1948-49 Association year, with a free copy going to each member on record up to May 1, 1949. All royalties on the book, available to nonmembers for $1.50, went to the Association.[42]

Dedicated to founder T. T. Frankenberg, the 246-page volume covered all aspects of college publicity. It was published as a companion to *Public Relations: A Program for Colleges and Universities* written by W. Emerson Reck of Colgate. Reck edited the manual and wrote the introductory chapter and the chapters on "Publicity Through Magazines" and "Efficient Operation of the Publicity Office." Other co-authors were Arthur L. Brandon of the University of Michigan, "Gathering and Evaluating Materials for Publicity" and "Publicity for Special Events"; Horace Renegar, "Publicity Through the Newspapers: Writing and Editing News"; Schellenger and William F. Rounds of Ohio State University, "Publicity Through the Newspapers: Dissemination of News"; Alice L. Beeman of the University of Michigan and Helen Munns Miller of Colgate University, "Extra Dividends on News Coverage"; Max E. Hannum, "Publicity Through College Publications"; Schellenger, "Publicity by Direct Mail" and "Maintaining Cooperation With the Publicity Office"; Douglass W. Miller of Syracuse University, "Publicity Through the Screen"; Edward D. Whittlesey, University of Denver, "Publicity From the Platform"; Elmer G. Sulzer, University of Kentucky, "Publicity Through Radio"; E. Ross Bartley, Indiana University, "Publicity Through Displays and Exhibits"; John P. DeCamp, University of Cincinnati, "Publicity Through Pictures"; Paul Faris, Hendrix College, "Publicity for Student Recruitment"; Edmund S. Carpenter, Marquette University, "Publicity for Sports Promotion"; Edward H. Stromberg, Northwestern University, "Publicity for Fund Raising"; Charles E. Widmayer, Dartmouth College, "Publicity's Role in Alumni Relations"; and Robert X. Graham, University of Pittsburgh, "Ethics for Publicity."[43]

With the approval of the Executive Committee, a meeting of ACPRA members interested in sports was for the first time held independently of the annual convention.

The program, drawn by William Wranek, Jr., of the University of Virginia in cooperation with Robert A. Cook, vice president for sports, was held in New York City on January 7-8 in conjunction with the annual meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The separate meeting for sports information directors, initially proposed by Wranek a year earlier, was so successful that it was continued thereafter until College Sports Information Writers of America was organized as a separate association in 1957. Sessions for sports information directors were also continued on the annual ACPRA convention program until that time.[44]

Benjamin Fine, New York *Times* education editor who four years earlier had been critical of many releases he received, told ACPRA members through *College Public Relations* that he was finding the preparation of releases markedly improved.

"While here and there I run across a 'horrible example', they are few and far between," Fine wrote. "More and more the professional stamp is being placed on the releases. The most important factor in this improvement lies in the work done by the American College Public Relations Association. The sound advice, the regional and annual conferences, the publication of your journal, as well as special surveys made by the research men, have had their beneficial results. My best copy usually comes from members of ACPRA."[45]

ACPRA suffered the loss of two past presidents within a seventeen-day period in 1948. *College Public Relations* in May brought news of the death of J. Willard Ridings, and the June issue announced the death of Earl Reed Silvers. Ridings, fifty-three, had died on March 9 and Silvers, fifty-seven, on March 26.

Full color was used for an ACPRA publication for the first time in May, when the front cover of *College Public Relations* showed Colorado's Royal Gorge, one of the state's scenic spots delegates might visit in connection with the June convention.

"Long Range Planning in Educational Public Relations" was the theme for the Association's 1948 convention held in Denver on June 23-27. The keynote speaker was the immediate past president, Harold Schellenger, his subject, "This Business of Education."

"If there's one major impression in my mind for this year I have been out of educational work [with an advertising agency]," Schellenger said, "it is the conviction that I didn't know nearly as much about public relations as I thought I did. . . . My associations were mainly with other people in education. We gained much from our mutual association. But beyond and around us was another world about which we knew little. . . .

"Idealistic as colleges may and should be, we must reckon always with the fact that our real base is in the everyday work of the world. And yet, dependent as we are on those in economic life, our educators, and our educational public relations directors, still know all too little about the thinking and acting of the people of that other world."

Schellenger told his listeners that they could learn much from studies of the policies, literature, indoctrination systems, suggestion systems, community programs, and research of the business world.

"What does all this mean for directors of educational public relations?" Schellenger asked. "In terms of the business world, you are the merchandisers and the salesmen of education. Successful merchandising presupposes an efficient manufacturing operation, one in which every manager and every laborer shall do his best. It requires a good product, one which fits the needs of society and stands up under the most difficult competition. And it calls for a healthy market, in which there shall be no preventable sales resistance to your efforts. If our colleges in any substantial number are to reach the ideals of performance and usefulness which I hold possible for them, you as public relations officers must show the way.

"And ACPRA, as one of the few organizations in education which cuts across all kinds of institutions of higher learning, has the obligation and the challenge to help you, the institutions which you represent, and all other educational organizations, to see the vision of the promised land and to make it the reality it can be."[46]

The comparatively new field of opinion research received major attention at the Denver convention, first with an address by Don Cahalan, director of the Opinion Research Center at the University of Denver, and later through a panel discussion involving three ACPRA leaders and two outside experts.

Cahalan emphasized that any institution should begin by knowing what its various publics think of it and its products. "If the people are wrong," he said, "the institution needs to put into motion a program of remedial public relations. I have yet to see where an opinion survey has resulted in anything but making the institution more responsible to genuine public needs."

After discussing several case studies, Cahalan concluded: "The public relations of any university can be clarified by applying well-established research techniques. One primary stumbling block in the way of college public relations in the future is the fairly widespread tendency to depend on somebody's subjective judgment rather than the facts of the case. The problems of public relations are too complex for any but professionally trained researchers."[47] Objectives of surveys, techniques, interpreting results, and implementation were discussed during the panel session.

With public relations directors being called upon more and more to help lay solid foundations for fund-raising success, this area of activity also received major attention on the Denver program. The speaker for the session on "Public Relations' Place in Fund Raising" was James Almond, president of American City Bureau.

"Had the subject for this address been 'Public Relations and Fund Raising' there would have been incorrectness and inconsistency," Almond told the delegates. "The two things are not separate nor are they estranged. Fund raising *is* public relations and without one there is little of the other. A campaign is but a definite, tangible expression of the fine art which you permanently practice."

" . . . Often we hear that a college cannot afford a good public relations program. Our answer to that statement is that it then can ill afford a good campaign. Can the college afford the service of mowing the campus, of sweeping the president's office, of maintaining some semblance of presentability, of paying its faculty salaries? If it cannot, then it certainly *needs* public relations; if it can, then it certainly *can afford* public relations."

Almond declared that college campaigns are the most difficult of all fund-raising efforts. "Why these difficulties in campaigning; why this ineffectiveness in public relations?" he asked. "Certainly, it is not for lack of publicity; the average American college or university is perhaps the best publicized single feature of our modern life. Surely, it cannot be for lack of merit in our programs; in spite of weaknesses, the least of our institutions of higher learning will rate high priority in the good things of democracy which must be preserved.

"Perhaps the answer lies in a misconception of the philosophy of action. We forget that action is based upon *conviction* rather than upon *knowledge* alone. . . . There is but one conclusion—all the publicity in the world is not sufficient to bring needed support to our colleges and universities. Publicity must be but a part of a total of public relations—*public service,* if you please—which will bring convictions as to the place of our institutions in our democracy, as to the primary and fundamental merits of their programs, and as to the critical need for support of every good feature which they represent."[48]

Additionally, the convention program included sessions on radio and television, faculty relations, and alumni relations; clinics dealing with various publicity and public relations problems, techniques, and procedures; and breakfast sessions for the same groups which had sat down together for early morning conferences the year before.

Fears of some that the increases in dues might have an adverse effect upon the Associations's growth were definitely laid to rest. Membership Vice President W. Henry Johnston revealed that ACPRA by June 10 had a record 751 on its rolls. Receipts of the Association for the first time in its history had exceeded $10,000, the total going to $11,749. Meanwhile, the endowment fund started at the suggestion of T. T. Frankenberg in 1942 had experienced its best year, the total growing to $528.[49]

Following an eight-month study by a five-man committee headed by Arthur Brandon, a series of amendments to the constitution were recommended at Denver. The most important amendments provided for membership under four categories; established a Board of Directors, reduced the number of elected officers, and increased the number to be appointed; gave official status to the Publications Advisory Board set up by Executive Committee action the year before; and made official the $15 and $7.50 dues structure adopted on a trial basis after a mail referendum ten months earlier. Some members felt that those dues were too low, but a motion to amend the constitution to set the fees at $25 and $15 was tabled after some debate.

Memberships recommended for the new constitution were institutional, educational agency, personal, and honorary. Standards for membership eligibility would also be raised by the new consitution. Institutional membership, for instance, would henceforth be open only to those institutions whose admission policies required graduation, or its equivalent, from an accredited secondary school, or to those listed in the last published edition of the *U. S. Directory of Higher Education*. Honorary membership could be bestowed upon an individual at a national convention only if such membership had been approved previously by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors.[50]

Elected officers of the Association under the new constitution were to be a president, a president-elect, three vice presidents, secretary-treasurer, and editor of the Association magazine. The president-elect, a new officer, was to assist the president on general matters pertaining to the Association. One vice president was to be in charge of membership activities, another in charge of district activities, and the third in charge of athletic activities.

Officers to be appointed with the approval of the Board of Directors within thirty days after the national convention were the editor of the convention report, *College Public Relations Annual*; business manager of publications, director of research, director of media activities, and convention director.

The Board of Directors established by the new constitution was to be composed of the elected officers, the immediate past president, and two directors-at-large elected at a national meeting from among persons who had served as district directors. Elected officers were to be chosen only from among institutional members.

The Publications Advisory Board legalized by the new constitution was to be composed of eleven members—three elected and three appointed by the president, each for three-year terms; the president, the editor of the Association magazine, the editor and the editor-elect of the convention report, and the business manager of publications.

The new constitution also officially established District VII as a "mail district" to include areas not otherwise assigned, and reduced Association awards to three types: Award for Distinguished Service (by members), Award for Outstanding Achievement (by members), and Award for Distinguished Service to Education (by nonmembers).

Awards might be given, but need not be given annually, to not more than two persons in each category. The new constitution stipulated that only the national Association could give awards. Districts, several of which had established awards, were henceforth to confer only special citations. Association awards were to be conferred only through the Board of Directors when two thirds of the directors concurred.[51]

Delegates to the Denver convention also adopted a new Code of Ethics presented by a committee headed by John DeCamp, who had served as chairman of the committee responsible for the code adopted in 1941. The new code opened with a preamble, "In order to advance the cause of higher education, we, the members of the American College Public Relations Association . . . in dealing with our own institutions, with the press, radio and other means of communication, and with all the members of all our publics . . . do hereby ordain and establish the following principles to guide our conduct: (1) Let us respect the truth. . . . (2) Let us be dignified and well-mannered. . . . (3) Let us be responsible to the public. . . . (4) Let us be fair and sincere. . . . (5) Let us be progressive. . . . (6) Let us be cooperative. . . . (7) Let us be loyal. . . ."[52]

The Association at its annual convention banquet presented four awards—to Boyd H. McKeown, long-time executive head of the Joint Committee on Public Relations for Educational Institutions of the Methodist Churches, and to Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council for distinguished service to education; to Edward D. Whittlesey, University of Denver, for distinguished service to the Association over a period of thirteen years, ten of them in regional or national offices; and to W. Nicholas Kerbawy of Michigan State College for outstanding achievement in sports publicity.[53]

Max E. Hannum, assistant to the president at Franklin and Marshall, and national officer for four years, two as vice president for membership and two as secretary-treasurer, was elected president of the Association at its second business session in Denver. Others elected were: president-elect, E. Ross Bartley, Indiana University; secretary-treasurer, Edward P. VonderHaar, Xavier University; vice presidents, Mrs. Veta Lee Smith, Marshall College, memberships; Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma, regions; and Parry D. Sorensen, University of Utah, athletics; editor, Howard S. Curtis, Brown University, and directors-at-large, Francis C. Pray, Union College, and Bradford D. Ansley, Emory University. Officers later appointed by the new president were: business manager, Roy K. Wilson, National Education Association; editor of *College Public Relations Annual*, Max W. Milbourn, University of Wichita; director for research, Marvin M. Black, University of Mississippi; director for media activities, W. Lowell Treaster, Michigan State College; and 1949 convention secretary, John R. Busick, George Washington University. Washington, D.C., had been selected as the 1949 convention site.[54]

The "positivistic enthusiasm" with which Renegar guided ACPRA during his administration was never more evident than as he prepared to turn the leadership over to his successor. He had throughout the year urged members "to consider our public relations programs as a whole, examining the component units which compose them." Now in his presidential address at the convention banquet he spoke on "What Education Should Expect of Public Relations."

"Every business, every property title, every statute of law, church, lodge—yes, university—exists," declared Renegar, "because the public considers it desirable; or, more accurately perhaps, because the public does not consider it undesirable. If this be true, then every institution must not only merit but win for itself a more substantial public support. Support is easily something we have today but which tomorrow or with a new generation may be lost. It is not something which must be occasionally tended but like a fire it must be stoked and replenished constantly. Civilizations that failed to keep the fires of knowledge tended are today dead civilizations . . . education has the right to expect the men and women charged with public relations programs to take the lead in gaining public understanding of the mission of higher education, and its collateral parts, teaching and research.

"It is not sufficient for us to record the daily life of the faculty and students for the press. It is our duty to interpret and make real to the public the larger purpose of higher education in such a way that the university-trained man and woman will be conscious of the duty which he or she owes to the world. Education recognizes that the new challenges which world leadership imposes upon America mean that the day has passed when men and women can afford to think provincially. Unfortunately, physically-adult America is still juvenile when it comes to falling for the claptrap of many unscrupulous politicians. If these evils in the democracy are to be overcome; if democracy—which today faces its greatest

test in our time—is to succeed, it must do so by the better practice of democracy. Therefore, the university student and the graduate must be made to understand that he owes a debt to society; that he is one of the privileged few who, because of his mental capacity to receive higher education, is being educated by society to provide the right leadership. The student and the alumnus should be made aware that society has bestowed upon him the privilege of an education. It is our mission to make *real* the responsibilities of citizenship that go with an education, to acquaint the public with the aims and needs of education, to interpret higher education in accordance with the broadest concepts provided by the administration and the traditions of our colleges and universities."[55]

Progress With a Light-Hearted Leader

Notable advances were being made on several fronts. Working toward the establishment of a national office, implementation of major recommendations made by the Plans and Policies Committee, and increased recognition of its contributions in the field of higher education, ACPRA in 1948-49 was marked by a light-heartedness unknown in relation to its work since the administration of Josef F. Wright in the middle 1930s. To the president for the year, Maxwell Eugene Hannum, goes credit for the leadership which carried the Association to greater achievement while maintaining a generally relaxed atmosphere.

Hannum had served as assistant to the president at Franklin and Marshall since 1946. He had earned widespread recognition in the fields of publicity and public relations during seventeen years at Carnegie Tech, first as sports publicity director and later as director of the institution's bureau of news and publications. At the same time he had become widely known in the collegiate world as a basketball coach who sometimes "performed miracles" with the material available under Carnegie's no scholarship policy. He had accepted the coaching job "on a temporary basis" in 1932, three years after leaving a reportorial position on the Pittsburgh *Press*, to become "praise agent"—Hannum's own term— for Carnegie's sports teams. Although Hannum had very little background as a player and no previous coaching experience except as a mentor for a church league team, he had become a crack basketball official in the 1920s. His teams at Carnegie Tech seldom won half their games and one was entirely winless, but two others won championships in the Eastern Intercollegiate Conference and Hannum was still "filling in" as coach in 1946.

Hannum's coaching system was simple, wrote a Pittsburgh sports editor. He quoted the Tech mentor: "Always have fun, make yourself one of the gang, and steal all the good plays you can from the other fellow."[56]

During his coaching days, Hannum was prime copy for sports writers who wrote fondly of the man as Der Maxie, Der Maximilian, Madcap Maxie, and the Wizard of Schenley Park. Locally and throughout the Eastern Intercollegiate Conference he became famous for the wad of chewing gum ever-present in tense moments and for his unmerciful heckling of officials.

"Coach Hannum," wrote R. J. Hopkins in his "Sportlight" column in the Pittsburgh *Sun Telegraph*, "believes in expressing his opinions—but volubly. Mr. Hannum has various degrees of 'referee' anger. When mildly soured on a ref's handling of a game, he merely shuffles his feet and casts questioning glances at the ceiling. The next stage is the 'throwing-of-sweatshirts-toward-the ceiling' stage. This indicates that he is a bit peeved. . . . When he jumps to his feet and starts off on a long string of invectives, he's very mad. If you've ever been within a mile of the gym when this has happened, you'll know just how clearly he tells the ref what's wrong. . . . In passing, Mr. Hannum is just as quiet and generous in his actions away from the heat of a game as he is vigorous right in the middle of a game."[57]

A writer for the *Carnegie Tech Tartan* on June 6, 1944, scooped even the columnists of Pittsburgh's dailies when he revealed that Hannum's favorite hobbies were painting and good music. The writer added, however, that Hannum's interests in these arts could not be termed highly aesthetic.

"He has painted his whole house twice inside and out," the writer continued, "and has a magnificent record of seven buckets of paint spilled at various locations on his premises: one on the refrigerator, two in the hedge, three prosaically on the ground, and the one which almost broke up his home on the brand new chenille spread of a twin bed. . . . In the musical field he shares a consuming passion for jive. . . . In the literary field Max has written several romances for the pulps and enjoys reading about people in good biographies. . . . Another of his outside pursuits is his regular attendance at church. He keeps a stop-watch on the minister and has read the Bible through seven times over a period of years in preparation for being a church trustee. . . . Max has sworn at least twelve times to reform as a basketball coach. . . . He declares that he will never again swear, that he will ride no more officials, that he will not throw his coat either on the floor or in the air, and that he will be a gentleman because he is a religious person."

In his work at Franklin and Marshall and in his service as ACPRA's president following two years as secretary-treasurer and two as membership vice president, Hannum displayed the same enthusiasm and extraordinary energy that had won him praise at Carnegie Tech.

Establishment of a central office in Washington, a major goal of the Association for a decade, was all but accomplished by the end of Hannum's administration following continued negotiations with the Association of American Colleges.

Reporting at the 1949 convention in Washington, the Central Office Committee, now headed by John P. DeCamp, indicated that the proposed national office could be financed in one of two ways: by added revenues through an increase of dues or financial aid through a special grant or grants. In the opinion of both the Board of Directors and DeCamp's committee an increase in dues seemed inadvisable at that time. Thus, the committee had thoroughly explored the second possibility and recommended to the delegates, with the unanimous approval of the Board of Directors, acceptance of an offer which had been transmitted from the Association of American Colleges through its executive director, Guy E. Snavely.

This offer, DeCamp reported, included first a grant of $6,500 toward expenses of a central office staff; and secondly the use, rent free, of two rooms in the organization's second-floor quarters at 726 Jackson Place, N.W., in Washington. When the delegates heard DeCamp's report, they joyfully accepted the proposal and its recommendation that the Board of Directors be given power to conclude arrangements and sign a contract with the Association of American Colleges at the earliest possible date. A most important milestone in the life of the Association appeared to be immediately ahead. But disappointment and delay were in the offing. In the fall issue of the Association magazine, the editor said an announcement was forthcoming concerning "a new crisis and renewed efforts on the central office front."[58] Great progress had been made, but another year would have to pass before the two associations would finally arrive at an agreement making possible the establishment of a central office for ACPRA.

By the beginning of the Association's fiscal year in September, 1948, Hannum was ready with his committee appointments. Three new committees were included, one to provide publicity on Association activities through the 1949 convention, another to plan and arrange for the convention the most extensive exhibit in ACPRA history, and the third a special committee to consider and determine realignments in district boundaries such as those recommended by past vice presidents in charge of districts.[59]

DeCamp also continued to chair a committee on cooperation with American Education Week. Under his leadership ACPRA increased its efforts in behalf of the one-week fall program sponsored by the National Education Association, the American Legion, the U.S. Office of Education, and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. This was done largely through a six-page brochure which ACPRA printed and mailed to presidents and public relations officers of all institutions of higher learning throughout the country, members and nonmembers alike. The brochure, emphasizing the week's theme, "Strengthening the Foundations of Freedom," was devoted largely to suggestions for tie-in actions colleges and universities could take. Officials of both NEA and of colleges and universities were high in their praise of ACPRA's efforts and the cooperative effort was continued. DeCamp was able to report at the 1949 convention that representatives of the Association were again working with the four sponsors and that plans for observance the following November were well in hand with "Making Democracy Work" as the theme.[60]

Four other cooperative efforts of special note were made by ACPRA during 1948-49. One of these undertook "to develop standards for the college preparation of entrants into the field of public relations." The U.S. Office of Education set up a three-man committee which met regularly in Washington to achieve the aim.[61] Past President Harold Schellenger was ACPRA's representative and his report in April revealed that the committee was "doing everything it can do to discourage a headlong jump into the offering of public relations courses and curricula by schools which do not have the background or the faculty or the concept to offer that kind of work, but simply want to get on the bandwagon of a growing profession."

Schellenger emphasized that preliminary surveys fully justified the raising of storm warnings against precipitate action, both for the colleges and for young people desiring careers in public relations. "A growing volume of evidence reveals that prospective employers of public relations personnel are not inclined to give preference to applicants who, as undergraduates, have specialized in that subject. The desire is now and evidently will continue to be for persons of broad cultural background rather than mere technical proficiency in some of the tools of the trade." To point up his statement Schellenger indicated that eighty percent of the firms replying to a questionnaire had said they preferred personnel who had taken background courses as undergraduates and concentrated on professional and technical work during graduate study. Sixty-four percent also indicated that they favored applicants whose undergraduate studies had been taken in liberal arts colleges, preferably with English as their major.[62]

The kind of preparation for public relations work which gained increasing favor among both educational and business institutions was described in *College Public Relations* by James Jordan, who later would become ACPRA's thirty-fourth president. This was an intern program, the first of its kind, established at the University of Iowa in mid-1947 as the brain child of Wilbur Schramm, at that time director of the university's School of Journalism. The program offered opportunity for up to ten selected graduate students and an occasional outstanding senior in the undergraduate school to work directly on the kind of problems they would face in public relations jobs. They received no academic credit but were paid from $50 to $100 a month, depending on the number of hours devoted to their work. "Every effort is made to introduce the public relations intern to the toughest problems available," Jordan said in reporting on the program. "Such tasks as interpreting administrative action, explaining an increase in fees, or pacifying an irate and influential parent may be tossed into his lap."[63]

ACPRA continued cooperation with UNESCO. It was represented by two accredited representatives when the U.S. National Commission to the United Nations organization held its second national conference in Cleveland on March 31-April 1-3, 1949. Three months later ACPRA joined with the National Education Association in sponsoring a National Public Relations Work Conference held in Boston. ACPRA cooperation with the Association of American Colleges, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the American Council on Education was also continued, with many Association members speaking and serving on panels at meetings. Considerable counseling was also done with individual colleges relative to their public relations problems.[64]

With Howard Curtis of Brown as editor, *College Public Relations* in 1948-49 continued the departmentalization of content by subject matter. It gave generous space to such public relations areas as admissions, internal relations, personal relations, the church press, the scholastic press, student publications, community relations, and safety drives. Curtis at once named three assistant editors: Elizabeth A. Green of Mt. Holyoke, for personals; Parry D. Sorensen, University of Utah, for sports, and Louis H. Bell, Pennsylvania State College, for news pictures.[65] Miss Green's section, now headed "For Your Information," sometimes ran as much as six pages. Bell secured the services of Harold Blumenfeld, managing editor of Acme Newspictures, as critic and the number of news pictures run with comments, critical and complimentary, was greatly increased.[66] In George H. Holmes of Iowa State Teachers College, ACPRA also got its first circulation manager and the income from publications shot up thirty-five percent for the year.[67] Subscriptions for nonmembers for the magazine were still $3 a year, the fee set by the Association's Executive Committee in 1946, and the price of the annual for nonmembers likewise continued at the $3 price.

One of the circulation problems of *College Public Relations* in 1948-49 was revealed in the January issue of the magazine. Mailing of the November issue had been delayed through a series of incidents involving the printer, Railway Express, the secretary-treasurer, and the editor. While in the hands of the express company, en route from Commonwealth Press in Worcester, Massachussetts, to Xavier University in Cincinnati, the shipment of magazines picked up a piece of rope on which was incongruously attached a tag labeled "galvanized ware." Accordingly, the shipping clerk shunted the package into the "galvanized ware department" at Xavier. Only after considerable sleuthing was Secretary-Treasurer VonderHaar able to track it down and get it in the mail through ACPRA's modest "central office" which had been transferred from Franklin and Marshall via pickup truck.

Curtis introduced one new feature, a series of articles through which business executives and college public relations directors emphasized the manner, means, and importance of good relationship between business and institutions of higher education. Those rapidly growing media of communications, television and FM radio, also received increased attention during the year.

The byline of Lynn D. Poole, later to become ACPRA's thirty-third president, appeared over "Television—the New Challenge," the most comprehensive article on the subject yet published in the Association magazine. The Johns Hopkins public relations director quoted statistics showing that the number of television sets in the country had jumped from 200,000 to 700,000 in the last two years. Pointing out that television was a medium "through which we can illustrate every activity in our college." Poole underlined this sentence: *"We must educate our faculties and administrative bodies to enthusiastic acceptance of the new challenge."*[68]

Television also came in for major attention at the Association's 1949 convention, first when a panel of three network, government, and local station officials was chaired by Poole and secondly when nine men representing various areas of sports heatedly discussed the subject, "TV and Box Office Receipts." Members of the general panel agreed that television presented a challenge and an opportunity for public relations people with initiative and ideas.[69]

In February, *College Public Relations* reported, that DePauw University had been authorized to operate the nation's first 10-watt FM station in the country.[70] This size later became widely popular on college and university campuses.

A medium of public relations receiving little attention from the nation's colleges and universities at this time was discussed in the Association magazine by John Lawrence Seaton, president emeritus of Albion College, in "PR and the President's Home." Pointing out that the president's home should be a center "for frequent and friendly gatherings of the faculty," "for frequent and friendly visits by students, individually or in groups," "for extending courtesies which may contribute to the understanding, loyalty, and support of trustees," and for extending courtesies which may "create good will among actual and possible patrons and friends," Seaton said that the president's home "deserves much more consideration from boards of trustees than it has received."

"The president's home," he asserted, "bears a relation to the college much like that of the parsonage to the church, but more significant since the influence of the parsonage is mainly local, while that of the president's home extends to distant friends and patrons of the college."[71]

In one of several articles emphasizing the importance of internal relations—that public relations begins at home—*College Public Relations* for the first time discussed in depth the importance of giving attention to the happiness of faculty and staff wives. Writing on "There's No Place Like Home—for PR," Jesse R. Long, director of publicity and later executive vice president of the University of Toledo, said, "When we say 'PR begins at home' we ordinarily mean 'Let's sell our staff on our institution and its program before we start in on the outsiders', but maybe we should look around to see if we have started back far enough. . . . If the little woman is dissatisfied she's hardly likely to keep the secret locked in her bosom, so it's pretty hard to see how the husband can remain happy in his job either. . . . The faculty wife should be made to feel that she is a part of the 'company of 'scholars' which makes up the university."[72]

Public relations for the junior college was the subject of an article, "Junior College PR Investment," written by Jesse P. Bogue, executive secretary of the recently-organized American Association of Junior Colleges. "There are as many sound reasons for the small college to promote favorable public attitudes as there are for the larger institutions," Bogue wrote. "At once the question of finances will be raised. The answer to this question may be found in the fact that a well-executed program of public relations is an *investment* rather than an expenditure."[73]

ACPRA's roster for 1948-49 revealed that fifty-four junior colleges now held memberships, compared to twenty-nine three years earlier.[74]

The last issue of *College Public Relations* for 1948-49 reported that the first copy of *College Publicity Manual*, autographed by all eighteen of its authors, had been presented to T. T. Frankenberg at a dinner held in Columbus by Ohio's college public relations officers and their wives. The copy presented to Frankenberg, to whom the book was dedicated, had been on a seven-month 5,900-mile tour through twenty-one states to secure the signatures of the contributing authors.[75] When the ACPRA-sponsored book had come from the presses of Harper and Brothers in the preceding September, editor W. Emerson Reck had claimed that it had "enjoyed the widest prepublication circulation of any book yet produced." Reck, who had just become vice president of his alma mater, Wittenberg College, based his unique claim on the fact that, in outline, manuscript, or proof form the manual had "circulated" more than 25,000 miles through twenty-two states with him during the twenty-eight months prior to August 5, 1948, the date on which the page proof and index went to the publisher.[76]

"Higher Education in the Nation's Future" was the theme selected for ACPRA's 1949 convention by President Hannum, Convention Chairman John Busick, and a committee including Washington-area members. By April members had been informed through *College Public Relations* that the program would include such well-known names as those of Tennessee Senator Estes Kefauver, Earl J. McGrath, U.S. Commissioner of Education, and John Dale Russell, director of the Division of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, plus panels on "Some Major Issues in Higher Education Today," "Television in the Future of Higher Education," "Catalogs and Bulletins," "Publicizing the Science Story," and "Will TV Kill Gate Receipts?" and the reports of officers and committees. Promised, too, were "as artistic and meaningful a group of exhibits as modern visual techniques can devise" and sightseeing tours to Mount Vernon and other places of historic interest in the capital area.

In his address of welcome, Cloyd Heck Marvin, president of George Washington University, pointed out that college presidents once rejected the idea of public relations. Now, he declared, public relations had won a secure place in the building of social good in a time when "there is a greater need than ever before for the integrity of our colleges to be known."[77]

Horace Renegar, the immediate past president, delivered the keynote address.

"I suggest that we probe deeper into our need for the interpretation of education," Renegar told the delegates. "In the modern period, many have held that the freedom to learn is an absolute. . . . The American republic has fostered that freedom as perhaps no other nation of this era. Yet, today, in a world torn between ideologies, it has become dangerous at times to one's welfare to explore new ideas. Colleges and universities must preserve that right. They must study all ideas, searching out the truth.

"To examine an idea does not connote approval of it any more than a study of cancer in the medical laboratories implies that cancer has the approbation of physicians. . . . Education in America must be interpreted and understood so that we may not deviate from the search for truth. That is the primary need for public relations. . . . Our purpose would seem to be unmistakably clear. It is to give understanding to this heritage—the freedom to learn."[78]

Senator Kefauver, the fiery freshman senator who only recently had campaigned with a coonskin cap as his symbol, went all out for federal aid to education in his address.

"We must," he declared, "take the best brains and the finest young people that the nation can produce and develop them to their utmost potentialities. We must teach them democracy as it has never been taught before, in a spirit of conative optimism—that is in a spirit of conscious, all-out effort to do something about the perpetuation of democracy, rather than sit passively by and lose all by apathy. . . . Our future depends on it; democracy depends on it; world peace depends on it."[79]

Federal aid to education was not accepted as the panacea for higher education's problems by all educators on the Washington program. Among those who saw dangers in such aid was Guy E. Snavely, executive director of the Association of American Colleges, who declared:

"I am opposed to federal aid to higher education for a number of reasons. In the first place, if you have federal aid, you must have federal control. There is just no other way around that subject. And it is logical. The person who pays the bills ought to have a say as to what is done with the money. And when you have federal control, you have one type of institution of higher education. And that is just down the primrose path to a totalitarian type of government."[80]

With educators seeing danger in federal aid to education, yet fearing that the sources of large gifts to education were drying up, the delegates gave close attention to an address made by Arnaud C. Marts, president of Marts and Lundy and former president of Bucknell University.

"Giving to colleges has not reached an end," declared Marts, expressing irritation with those who were "passing around the cliché that the day of great and generous gifts to colleges and universities was past."

"I want to add a little optimism to this discussion," Marts continued. "Do you realize that during these past fifteen years when college presidents and others have been saying that the day of large giving is over, that during that period the giving to colleges has been gradually coming back, year after year, from the low point it hit during the depression, and that it is now higher than it ever was in history?"

Marts then quoted U.S. Office of Education figures indicating that $139,000,000 received in 1929 was the high point for voluntary giving before the depression, and that in 1948 such giving had totaled more than $150,000,000. Moreover, he said, $75,350,000 of the 1948 total had been given by forty-six persons in amounts of $25,000 and up.

"In my opinion," said Marts, "we have reached a potential beginning of far more generous giving to colleges and universities than has ever been experienced in this country in the past. I believe that you, as directors of public relations, can help stimulate that increased and growing generosity on the part of philanthropy to supplement what is obviously going to be an increased support on the part of governments."[81]

In reporting that ACPRA now had 839 members, Membership Vice President

Smith informed the convention that the Association numbered on its roster approximately half of the eligible institutions in the United States. Stewart Harral, vice president for regions, reported that all districts had again held meetings, five of them with new attendance records. Three proposals for changes in district boundaries were being submitted for consideration at the 1950 convention.[82]

In presenting eighteen recommendations made by the Plans and Policies Committee, Chairman Reck prefaced his report by saying, "Despite ACPRA's many advances, countless opportunities and challenges remain. Not the least of these challenges demands that ACPRA increase its efforts, within the Association and without, to heighten appreciation of the continually broadening responsibilities which rest upon the shoulders of public relations officers.

"Another challenge, no less important, demands that ACPRA strive increasingly for greater understanding and closer cooperation among those organizations which stand to benefit both themselves and all higher education by a more complete knowledge and practice of public relations principles."

The committee's recommendations, all of which were implemented by succeeding administrations, included one that "a panel of college presidents, discussing public relations problems, be made a part of each national convention, first to assure better understanding of common administrative problems, and, second, to broaden the conviction that public relations, in large measure, is created at the policy making level." Another recommendation which led to large benefits for both the Association and its younger members urged that planners of national conventions consider "possibilities for giving special help to newcomers in the field of public relations through a one-day pre-convention program of discussion, clinics, and counseling."[83]

In their business sessions, the convention delegates voted an honorary life membership to Robert Bristow Adams, the Association's second president in 1921, authorized the Exhibits Committee to charge fees for commercial exhibits, and changed membership categories approximately as recommended the year before to institutional, educational agencies, business and professional, and honorary.[84] No longer would the Association in designating institutional memberships use the basic U.S. Office of Education classifications in vogue since 1939: colleges and universities; professional and technical schools; teachers colleges and normal schools; junior colleges; black colleges and universities; business and professional memberships.

Most important action of the delegates, however, authorized establishment of a second Association periodical, a newsletter to be published biweekly starting in the fall of 1949, and discontinued the monthly *College Public Relations* in favor of a magazine to be known as *College Public Relations Quarterly*. The October issue each year would be devoted to proceedings of the annual convention.[85]

The slate presented by the Nominating Committee was accepted unanimously: president, E. Ross Bartley, Indiana University; president-elect, Stewart Harral, University of Oklahoma; secretary-treasurer, Edward P. VonderHaar, Xavier University (Ohio); vice presidents, Veta Lee Smith, Marshall College, membership, reelected; W. Henry Johnston, Harvard University, regions; and Tom Bost, Wake Forest College, athletics; editor of the quarterly, Bradford D. Ansley, Emory University; and directors-at-large, George Hall, California Institute of Technology, and Robert McKinney, Kirksville State Teachers College; Publications Advisory Board, Jackson Wells, University of Denver, and the Reverend Arthur L. Dussault, Gonzaga University. President Bartley later appointed the following officers: Editor of the newly-created *Newsletter*, Louis H. Bell, Pennsylvania State College; director of research, Whitman Daniels, Cornell; director of media activities, Lynn D. Poole, Johns Hopkins University; and business manager of publications, Roy K. Wilson, National Education Association.

Three leaders in the field of higher education, two of them past presidents of ACPRA, received the Associations's highest honors at the convention banquet. The award for distinguished service went to Harold Schellenger, past president and for six years an Association officer; the award for distinguished service to education to George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education for fifteen years; and the award for outstanding achievement by an Association member to J. Willard Ridings, posthumously.[86]

In his presidential address at the convention, Hannum, like his predecessors, sought to raise the sights of ACPRA members and inspire them to accept the growing challenges of their jobs.

"I am convinced," he said, "that we have reached the point where we must consider the establishment of standards for admission and the establishment of standards that must be met to retain membership in good standing. . . .

"Believe me, there is no place for press agents in education. There is a place for a dignified, honest publicity program as a strong right arm of the public relations body. . . . Our chief responsibility, if we are to realize our full potentialities, has to do with ourselves and the nature of our work. Be we errand boys, policy makers, publicity people, alumni secretaries, vice presidents, or what have you, we just can't attempt bona fide public relations assignments unless we sit with the administrative councils or have close and perfectly frank contacts with them. If we are to be worth our salt, we must be in positions to give advice, to be called upon for counsel, to have our opinions respected, if not always adopted. . . .

"I believe we must be so prepared, so interested, so able, so cognizant of all the problems of our institutions, so trusted, and so respected that we may be in a position to say to our administrators, 'Let's be careful how we talk, brother, it's our nickel!' This may pose problems for some of us. If we aren't the kind of people whose training, whose alertness, whose grasp of the situation, whose ability to sell ourselves, will impel our administrators to take us into their confidence and treat us as partners in this important business of interpreting higher education, we may as well resign ourselves to becoming hacks, high class clerks, and a classification of hired help somewhere between the grounds crew and the instructors. It might be better to just plain resign—get out and make way for somebody who can sell the president on an agressive program and show him how it can be implemented."[87]

A Boost From The Presidents

E. Ross Bartley, who served as ACPRA's president during a great landmark year—the year when arrangements for the establishment of a national office in the capital city were finally completed—had himself achieved distinction for accomplishments associated with the Washington scene. Before becoming director of the news bureau at Indiana University, his alma mater, at age forty-six, Bartley had had a notable career, most of it in Washington, as a newpaperman, political adviser, public relations director, and secretary to a vice president of the United States.

During eight years in the capital with the Associated Press, first as correspondent at the Senate, then at the White House, Bartley figured in two famous news beats. Both were scored after he became one of twenty newsmen accompanying President Harding on his tragic trip to the Pacific Coast and Alaska in the summer of 1923.

Harding was driving himself mercilessly in an effort to regain public confidence lost via the Teapot Dome and other scandals, and he persisted on speaking at every whistle stop as the train traveled southward toward San Francisco on the homeward trip. Tired, as were all members of Harding's entourage, Bartley and his junior partner on the AP team, Steve Early, later press chief for President Roosevelt, tossed a coin to see which would cover an early morning whistle stop. As the loser, Ross was the only newsman present at 6 a.m. the next day when Hubert Work, secretary of the interior, appeared in Harding's stead at Roseburg, Oregon. Work reported that the President, supposedly recovered from a bad case of ptomaine poisoning contracted in Alaska, was not feeling well. Corralling Harding's valet, Bartley learned that the

President was "mighty sick." After getting confirmation from the President's physician, Ross found himself with a scoop over his rival newsmen, all still sound asleep, but on a moving train that wouldn't stop for an hour or more.

"Bartley solved the problem with ingenuity and silver dollars," wrote Al Spiers in a feature, "Bartley 'Covered' Presidents." "Swiftly he typed his story, in quintuplicate, added a note, then wrapped each copy around a silver dollar with rubber bands. The note said, 'Deliver this to telegraph office—and keep dollar'. From the moving train, Ross pelted the next town's station and crossed his fingers.

"An hour later, when the train made its next stop, a sheaf of telegrams came aboard, addressed to other newsmen. All said something like this: 'The AP reports Harding ill. What about it?'" Before the newsmen could file answers, the train was moving again with the next stop another hour away. Bartley had scored a clear two-hour beat for the Associated Press.[88]

A few days later, when Harding died unexpectedly, Bartley scored again. Harding's illness, diagnosed as pneumonia, kept the newsmen close by in San Francisco's Palace Hotel, meanwhile delaying a big party planned for them. When the doctors finally reported Harding "apparently out of danger," most of the newsmen left early, eager to relax after nearly a week of strain. Bartley went for a quick dinner, telling Early that the latter should go to the party when he returned. Back from his dinner, Bartley found Early greatly agitated. While he had been chatting with Secret Service men outside Harding's room, the President's wife had rushed out, screaming "Get a doctor!" Early had filed some fast bulletins to the AP but feared he may have done so prematurely. Bartley sent Early back to Harding's floor while he digested his partner's bulletins. In minutes Early came racing back with the news that Harding was dead—that Herbert Hoover, secretary of commerce, had just so announced. The AP was so far ahead with its scoop that San Francisco newsmen on another floor got word of the President's death from their editors who had received it via the Associated Press.[89]

During the 1924 campaign the AP assigned Bartley to General Charles G. Dawes, the Republican vice presidential candidate. After the election, Dawes persuaded Bartley to become his personal secretary and four years later sent him to the Dominican Republic to help establish a budget system for that government.[90]

Bartley's first contact with ACPRA (at that time ACPA) came in 1933 when, while serving as director of publicity for Chicago's Century of Progress International Exposition, he cooperated with Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois publicist, to arrange a day at the fair for delegates to the Association's national convention.

Bartley had one more fling with the political world when he served as Governor Alf M. Landon's personal press representative in 1936 and traveled with him on his coast-to-coast campaign tours. "That was my low point," Bartley, a wry-humor man, chuckled years later. "We carried Maine and Vermont!"

Bartley served Indiana University for twenty-four years, first as director of its news bureau and then as director of university relations before retiring in 1962 with emeritus rank. He then served in a new position, administrative assistant in the Indiana University Foundation, until his death in 1969.

When he retired in 1962, both the university and the state expressed their appreciation of his work. Governor Matthew E. Welsh made him a "Sagamore of the Wabash," the Indianapolis Press Club gave him its first Grand Buffalo Award, and the Indiana House of Representatives adopted a resolution in appreciation of "his dedicated service to Indiana University and the citizens of the State of Indiana."[91]

"It takes all kinds to make a world, and Ross Bartley happens to be the right kind," summarized the Indianapolis *News* on May 23, 1962, following a surprise dinner given in his honor at the university by 350 guests. "He has made several million friends for the university and almost as many for himself. . . . He's one of the best and most respected soft-sell public relations men in the business."

As recorded previously, at the Washington convention ACPRA had voted to accept an offer of the Association of American Colleges to provide $6,500 and two rent-free rooms for the proposed national office. A month after the convention, however, the organization reported only $4,500 in sight for the subsidy with indications that no further progress was likely until fall. The Central Office Committee, again under the leadership of John DeCamp, its chairman since 1948, decided at a meeting in June that it would be impossible to start the office on an annual subsidy of less than $10,000 a year for five years. "The preliminary budget for the coming year . . . indicates that the Association will have to have a subsidy of at least that much and even then it would be limited in its activities," Bartley wrote after getting the committee's report. "So you see there is nothing definite about a central office and we may have to go through the coming year on the present basis."[92]

DeCamp and his committee, composed of past presidents Brandon, Collier, Hannum, and Schellenger and Secretary-Treasurer Edward VonderHaar, continued to negotiate. At a meeting with the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges on January 9, 1950, conditions which would make establishment of the national office finally possible were determined, pending confirmation by delegates to ACPRA's 1950 convention. Under the revised agreement the Association of American Colleges would provide a subsidy of $3,000 a year for three years but no rent-free space. It was evident that the central office could be established only if ACPRA's dues were raised substantially, and members of the other organization's board promised to support such a raise by issuing a statement to its membership: "If the American College Public Relations Association should vote to increase its dues, the Association of American Colleges commends support of such increase on the part of its own members."

Following the meeting with the board of the Association of American Colleges, DeCamp's committee set up a suggested initial budget of $18,000 for the new office. Since it appeared that the Association would have to raise at least $6,000 more each year to finance the office, the committee also recommended that the annual dues of primary institutional members be raised to $25 from the current $15.[93]

"All officers will continue in their present duties and responsibilities, particularly in regard to policy," DeCamp said in his report to the convention. "However, a principal reason for the central office is to relieve the officers of the many details now involved in the discharge of their routine work. As the committee pointed out previously, the Association has been extremely fortunate in receiving the benefits of time, talents, and stamina of its officers and the generous donations of their institutions' services, funds, and use of office equipment. While this situation will have to continue, of course, many routine duties will be transferred to the central office, for example, printing, mailing, and keeping of records such as membership.

"Equally important—and from the standpoint of each individual ACPRA member probably most important—the office will develop other needed services, such as public relations counseling, job placement, increased emphasis on research projects, etc. This relief from the chores of their duties will enhance the all-out volunteer services of our officers which are a chief strength and a tradition of ACPRA. In fact, this committee would go so far as to say that, in its experience, these volunteer services are unique in organizations in general.

"Then the increased prestige which will come to the Association because of a central, permanent headquarters will become an important asset in the development of ACPRA's own public relations program."[94]

In making his report, DeCamp pointed out that the $18,000 budget did not include the initial expense of office equipment—desks, chairs, typewriters, mimeograph, addressograph, and miscellaneous office equipment, fixtures, and supplies. The only equipment the Association owned was a four-drawer file it had acquired two years earlier when Mrs. French had become its first paid employee. The Association, DeCamp said, would greatly appreciate any donations members cared to make.[95]

In spite of the hazards the committee's report presented, the delegates at the national convention on June 28, 1950, approved the budget proposed and the advance in fees which would make it possible.[96] The decision, however, was not unanimous. Two of the 152 delegates voting registered opposition. One of the two—a member who would later become a national officer—asked in puzzlement of Eleanor Collier, originator of, and for twelve years an ardent worker for, the central office concept, "But, Eleanor, *what* would an executive secretary do?"[97]

Once the delegates had approved the national office plan, DeCamp's committee, at the request of the Executive Committee, began interviewing applicants for the post of executive secretary, the title approved for the officer who would be in charge of the Washington headquarters. The choice narrowed to seven persons and on August 5 members learned via the Association *News Letter* that Marvin W. Topping, director of public relations at the Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, had been elected.

Topping, thirty-eight, an ACPA member for eight years, had earlier been director of public relations at Union College in Barbourville, Kentucky. In 1949-50 he had been director of the Association's District IV, then comprised of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia. Hopefully, the new office would be opened within a month.[98]

The year 1949-50 saw the introduction of the publications plan, voted at Washington, and from the beginning it was apparent that the new schedule would be highly beneficial. Volume I, Number I, of the ACPRA *News Letter*, appeared on October 5, 1949, and came regularly to members every other week through May (after which two issues were published, one in June, the other in August). Normally, the *News Letter* was a four-page lithographed publication for which Editor Louis H. Bell of Pennsylvania State College reported that the per issue cost was $25 for 1,000 copies.[99] The fourth issue, dated November 5, announced that Editor Bell had suffered a heart attack and that his assistant, James H. Coogan, and other members of his staff, would perform the editorial job until he recovered.

The *News Letter* filled a long-felt need, giving space to news of members and districts, ACPRA projects, committee activities, the national convention, and cooperative programs which had been taking an ever increasing amount of space in the monthly magazine. Meanwhile, *College Public Relations Quarterly*, successor to the monthly magazine, was able to devote the forty-eight pages of each number after the first to in-depth articles on a wide variety of subjects. Number I of each volume, starting in the fall of 1949, covered the proceedings of the national convention of that year. The subscription rate for the *Quarterly* was set at $8 for nonmembers with a fifty percent discount for libraries, and the new format and extensive treatment of subjects seemed to appeal to librarians. The *Quarterly* also became the first Association publication to be registered as second-class matter.[100]

The ACPRA *News Letter* for December 5, 1949, reported another gain for educational public relations. The Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions in annual session in October had gone on record "as favoring increased emphasis on public relations and public information programs for higher education to the end that the public may be fully and properly informed on the objectives, programs, and accomplishments of higher educational institutions." In the same vein, it resolved that members of governing boards "encourage their institutional executives to give major attention to effective public relations for their institutions through well-chosen public relations personnel and through mutual understanding and cooperation established with public information media such as the press and radio." The next issue reported that Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Agency administrator, had invited ACPRA to be represented at the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth held November 29-30. John R. Busick, director of public relations at George Washington University and convention secretary for the recent Washington conference, represented the Association at the meeting.

In his column, "A Word From the President," Bartley reported in the *News Letter* of March 5, 1950, that ACPRA had also gained "new recognition and increased opportunity through the newly-created National Committee on Public Relations, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association." Headed by Chancellor J. D. Williams of the University of Mississippi, the committee of five included three members of ACPRA, Veta Lee Smith, Marshall College; Francis C. Pray, now of Hofstra College, and Thomas C. Morelock, University of Missouri. In addition, Roy K. Wilson, NEA administrative officer and long-time ACPRA member, and Bartley were serving as consultants.

The committee was charged with: "(1) exploring the problem of public relations as it relates to all aspects of higher education, and (2) pointing out what the next steps should be in order to achieve a better understanding of the nature and functions of the public relations program in higher education." Meeting January 8-9 for its first session, the committee had recommended as first steps the formulation of a clear statement of the objectives of higher education and the participation of designated ACPRA members as public relations consultants in the Fifth Annual National Conference on Higher Education to be held in Chicago April 16-18.

Chancellor Williams and NEA were pleased with the results, according to an article, "A Report on PR Cooperation," which Williams wrote for the *Quarterly*. Recommendations of the committee had been approved by NEA's Executive Committee and as a result approximately thirty college public relations persons had been invited to participate in the Chicago meeting, each of them assigned to a particular study group containing a cross-section of college and university personnel—presidents, deans, teachers, finance officers, registrars, student personnel officers, and others.

"It seemed appropriate to assign a public relations person to each group for several reasons," Williams wrote, "(1) to make certain that public relations would be properly represented; (2) to provide opportunity for members of the group to understand the public relations implications of the problem under discussion; and (3) to observe how capable specialists in the relatively new field of college public relations might aid in the solution of certain problems, or at least contribute toward a better understanding of them. The public relations committee [also] felt that the public relations person in each group would gain further insight into the current problems facing higher education generally and would return to his own institution with broader understanding of the relationship of his own activities to the national scene."

Each public relations participant was asked to give his reactions to the procedure used at the NEA conference and typical of the comments received by Williams were those of two men who would later become ACPRA presidents. "For the first time our Association had the opportunity to sit with a national group of educators and become an integral part of their activities," Lynn Poole of Johns Hopkins wrote. "We in ACPRA have presented our thinking toward the fact that we are not merely coping with the problems of our individual institutions, but as a group we must interpret the contemporary facts of education and work together for the future strength of education in this country."

Michael Radock, at that time director of public relations at Kent State University, saw in the move to bring ACPRA members into the NEA conference "one of the most significant actions that has been taken in educational public relations in recent years." Williams' own conclusion was "that the experiment in public relations through the means of study groups was successful and should be continued."[101]

Still another advance for public relations as a result of cooperative action was reported in the *News Letter* for April 5. The Joint Committee on Public Relations for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and ACPRA had sponsored a breakfast session on "The New Look in Public Relations" at the Atlantic City convention of AACTE in February. Seventy college presidents and deans had attended and at the session's end had expressed appreciation for ACPRA's "valuable aid in establishing the Joint Committee on Public Relations."

The literature related to public relations had begun to grow rapidly after World War II and it was essential that anyone wishing to keep step with problems, advances, opportunities, and responsibilities do an increased amount of reading. As a guide to such reading, Editor Bell in the first issue of the *News Letter* started a feature titled "What Is There to Read?" The initial presentation was a single paragraph, listing five recent articles and books with a few words about their content. Before the end of the year "What Is There to Read?" was sometimes running well over half a page. More important, the feature was the germ for a publication, *Education Abstracts*, which ACPRA established fourteen years later as one of its services to members. It also led the Association's Board of Directors in its January meeting to authorize preparation of a bibliography on public relations. This bibliography was prepared by Whitman Daniels, director of research, and mailed in May to all paid-up members of the Association.

At the same meeting the board authorized the establishment of an informational service for members identifying those firms qualified to provide specialized service or materials in the mechanical media field; approved plans for a totally new type of program for the national convention coming up at the University of Michigan in June, and recommended that, when possible, district meetings be held in conjunction with district meetings of the American Alumni Council (AAC).[102] Several districts, Number VIII especially, had been meeting with Council members for ten years, and found joint meetings beneficial.

The 1950 convention, first scheduled on a campus since the Association held its 1932 meeting at Vanderbilt University, would be "a working conference," according to plans presented to the board by Convention Director Arthur Brandon. These plans, for which the board gave enthusiastic approval, would involve scores of members as participants in seminars running the gamut of public relations interests. Housing for male delegates would be in the Michigan Union or nearby hotels, that for female delegates in the Michigan League, with charges for single rooms set at $3.50. Most meals would be taken at the Michigan Union. The registration fee, covering program expenses, three luncheons, three dinners, parties, and transportation to one feature session in Detroit, forty miles away, was expected to be $17 for members, $15 for spouses.[103] This later was changed to $18 and $16, respectively. Brandon was determined that the convention, unlike those of recent years, would at least break even. Eventually, he would report all expenses paid and turn over a surplus of $724 for the Association treasury.[104]

A major contribution of ACPRA *News Letter* for 1949-50 came on June 20, when the final regular issue of the year carried an eight-page "Idea Special Supplement." Forty-one proven ways to enhance high school, faculty, student, community, and family (campus) relations were presented. In addition, two pages of the issue's regular section were devoted to workable ideas.

The new forty-eight-page *College Public Relations Quarterly* had now taken on the appearance of an undersized *Harper's Magazine*, devoted to an average of eight "full length" articles per issue, plus two or three smaller pieces, a small section titled "The Professional Bookshelf," a page of information about contributors, and a page of editorials. During the year articles, almost all of them written by members, covered such diverse subjects as presidential viewpoints, the role of research, planning for expansion, academic freedom, centennial celebrations, publication budgets, specialization in public relations, sixteen-millimeter films, the faculty's place in public relations, plans for television, student recruitment, orientation in public relations, and the public relations council.

Professors wrote two of the major articles for the April, 1950, issue of the *Quarterly*. J. Kenneth Little, professor of education at the University of Wisconsin, wrote "Higher Education Needs Interpretation," and Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the Department of Higher Education at New York University, discussed "A Professor Looks at College PR."

"There is need for clear, forceful, and dramatic interpretation of higher education," Little asserted, "an interpretation which will focus upon the problems and issues of higher education as a whole, rather than upon the needs of single institutions, or types of institutions. The interpretation should be dynamic and future-facing. The animating purpose must be to develop the human resources of our country rather than to 'save' colleges and universities, their present organization, or their forms.

"There is a job to do for our country. In this task, public relations experts must help supply educational statesmanship and social vision, as well as imaginative technique and ingenious device. . . . The educational interpreter must, first, interpret the basic ideas and ideals upon which the whole of higher education in our society rests. . . . Second, he must sense and carry to busy educators the unspoken reactions of the public they are trying to serve."[105]

"There is an obvious need for improved coordination of all aspects of the public relations effort in the colleges," said Myers, who had just visited nearly 100 campuses during a year's leave of absence. "Most colleges literally have no public relations program and little comprehension of what such a program would entail. They are not aware of the fact that a public relations director cannot successfully *do* public relations. At best he can serve as a coordinator of all the many efforts and activities of the college that affect public relations. This is a highly complex and difficult task. It is a job for which few people have any particular fitness and for which almost none is being trained. I believe some contribution would be made toward a broader understanding of the nature of the task of the person in charge if the title should be changed from director to that of coordinator of public relations. . . .

"A good public relations policy recognizes that the college can become great only through the active, wholehearted, and sincere cooperation of all persons connected with the work and destiny of the college—the public, alumni, students, faculty, service staff, administration, and board of trustees. Each person connected with the operation of the college must understand and accept his appropriate responsibilities. Each must understand and respect the responsibilities and prerogatives of all others. Each must be given his appropriate opportunity for democratic sharing in the achievement of the purposes of the college as well as in the formulation of those purposes. Each person connected with the college, student, janitor, professor, secretary, receptionist, switchboard operator, president, registrar, bursar, dean, has a definite and an important public relations responsibility to the college. . . .

"Good communications and effective participation among all persons and groups essential to the successful operation of the college—students, faculty, service staff, administration, alumni, trustees—largely determine the amount of good will that the college can hope to develop. Securing, retaining, and increasing that supply of good will is not just the job of the public relations director. It is a job for all of us who are connected with the college. The public relations director will help us find better ways of doing the job effectively."[106]

Surveys made by Harry Heath, Jr., assistant professor of journalism at Iowa State College, and summarized in the *Quarterly*, revealed that presidents and public relations directors were drawing closer together in their understanding of public relations functions yet were still short of full agreement.

Presidents listed the following functions as the most important ones of public relations programs: (1) Informing the public of progress and accomplishments; (2) interpreting objectives and services to the public; (3) creating good will; (4) providing news releases; (5) evaluating public opinion and giving guidance in the development of policies; and (6) establishing and maintaining understanding with the public.

Public relations directors rated their major objectives in the following order: (1) Building good will for the institution; (2) adding to the college's reputation so that its scope of influence might be broadened; (3) gaining public support in order to receive adequate funds; (4) drawing outstanding students; (5) acquainting the public with new educational trends.

The survey of presidents also indicated increasing appreciation of public relations programs. Ninety-one percent said that they considered such programs "extremely important." Only one of 110 presidents participating in the survey thought such a program unnecessary. He, with the misunderstanding of public relations responsibility about which Harold Schellenger had spoken bluntly seven years earlier, commented: "Unnecessary with large veteran enrollment."[107]

When approximately 400 ACPRA members assembled at the University of Michigan on June 27 for their four-day national meeting, they found it would be the "working conference" Arthur Brandon had promised. At the heart of the program were seventy-seven seminars, meeting in six sessions and dealing with almost every conceivable topic in educational public relations. More than 150 members had active roles in these seminars as group directors, seminar leaders, and recorders.[108] Brandon's plan called for each leader to prepare in writing an advance statement of the materials to be considered in his course. Fifteen minutes were allowed for introductory statements followed by discussion from the floor. The reporter for each session was charged with writing a summary of his session before the end of each day. Summaries were then used in a conference publication issued daily.[109]

Also on the program were seven addresses, two business sessions, and a trip to Detroit. There the convention-goers saw the final assembly line of the Cadillac plant in operation and attended a lavish reception and buffet as guests of the General Motors Corporation. Brandon and his eleven aides on the convention committee also gave the delegates and spouses an added thrill. The long line of University of Michigan buses en route to Detroit was met at the city limits and led along the main thoroughfare by a police escort, all sirens blaring.[110]

The seminar on public relations for medical schools, which had the support of the American Association of Medical Schools, was the brain child of Marc G Waggener of Indiana University. Twenty-one persons participated in its six sessions, and at the conclusion the seminar's leaders petitioned ACPRA to establish a Medical-Public Health Division. A joint meeting of the Association's 1949-50 and 1950-51 Boards of Directors approved the petition in a session following the convention and the division became one of the Association's strongest arms.[111]

Keynote speaker for the convention was Max Hannum, immediate past president, his subject "The Clock and the Calendar."

"Working by the clock," he said, "we conduct ourselves solely in the light of our past experiences; working by the calendar we open our minds, receive and sift new ideas, reject or retain, make many mistakes, learn by trial and error, but become inevitably a part of the dynamic structure. By the clock we are content with what has always been. Clockwise we are happy in our inertia, resistant to experiment, resentful of innovation.

"By the calendar we are bound to be uneasy, but it is an eager uneasiness. It is a sincere unrest. It is an appreciation of the fact that public attitudes toward higher education have changed drastically during the last decade and a realization that we must find a way to funnel those new attitudes into a pool of favorable opinion."

Asked Hannum, "If your institution has never had a public relations department, but is considering the establishment of one, would you, as publicity director or public information director or college editor, be the logical choice to become its head?" "If the answer is 'No', you are in the wrong field. The fault lies with you. You are effective by the clock, but unimpressive by the calendar.

"To those of you whose lot has been to work only by the clock, I could make some hesitant suggestions," Hannum concluded. "These are: (1) If you are connected with a small college, learn all you can about fund raising. For unless you are publicly supported, you can be certain that your institution will be engaged in some kind of fund campaign in the not-too-distant future. Even if you have the services of a professional, the ongoing program will eventually be turned over to the public relations department. (2) If you don't have a community relations program, come up with an idea for one and offer to see it through. (3) Sell your president on three-cent public relations.* Offer to write for him letters on the slightest excuse. (4) Get ten ideas a week and pass one of them along to the president. (5) Always look for an opportunity to do something unselfish for a faculty member or a student. (6) Jump into civic activities with both feet. (7) Never complain about the amount of time spent on your job. (8) Never neglect the opportunity to speak in public, no matter how inarticulate you may be. You will be surprised how you will improve!

"The first thing you know, you will not only be important, you will be indispensable."[112]

In their business session the delegates updated the constitution to reflect recent changes in policy and procedure; approved twenty-two recommendations of the Plans and Policies Committee; approved awards for the year; elected to honorary life membership Harold Ellis, past president of the Association now about to retire from his post at the University of California; heard the reports of officers, and elected new officers.

The constitutional changes added to the list of appointive officers an executive secretary for the central office who would be named by and be responsible to the Board of Directors; established as offical publications the *College Public Relations Quarterly* and the *News Letter* which had been published by decision of the Board of Directors during the past year; made the editor of the *News Letter* an elected officer; provided for the *Quarterly* an associate editor who would publish the annual convention proceedings as the first issue of the magazine each fall; increased the membership of the Publications Advisory Board to twelve in addition to the *News Letter* editor; raised the dues of institutional primary, educational primary, and personal members to $25; eliminated the distinguished service award for members; reduced the number of districts to thirteen by eliminating the "mail district" formerly designated as VII and reassigning to other districts Pennsylvania and West Virginia which formerly made up District III.

Major recommendations of the Plans and Policies Committee (as Emerson Reck rounded out five years as its chairman) called for establishment of a long-range program built around the new central office; increased efforts to serve college administrators desiring help and guidance in establishing coordinated public relations programs; a survey of opportunities for giving increased service to special groups of colleges represented within the institutional membership; a survey of possibilities for closer cooperation with the American Alumni Council; assistance to educational institutions and organizations in holding panels, workshops, and symposia which would broaden understanding and appreciation of public relations values and procedures; reestablishment of the Committee on Public Relations Planning for ACPRA to take advantage of current opportunities for the Association in that area; appointment of a committee which would seek to assure standardized column headings and accurate figures for educational cost tables being published each year by magazines, life insurance companies, and similar groups; a survey to determine the ways, means, and extent to which educational public relations were being enhanced through cooperation with business and industry; compilation of a list of free-lance writers of established integrity through whom Association members might seek to bring worthy activities and personnel to the attention of magazines; and a survey to point up the uses and potential uses of television in educational public relations. Other recommendations dealt with financial matters and national convention planning and programs.[113] The convention format followed at Ann Arbor had received high praise and, referred to as "the Michigan plan," was used as a guide for many years.

Three awards, all of them to members, were presented at Ann Arbor. Hannum received the award for distinguished service to the Association and higher education, while Elizabeth A. Green of Mt. Holyoke College and Gertrude M. Hall of Illinois State Normal University received awards for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of higher education.[114]

---

*Postage for a letter was then only three cents.

Changes in personnel and administrative red tape were the major causes for failure of institutions to renew their membership in ACPRA, Veta Lee Smith, vice president for membership, reported. Budgeting limitations were the other reasons stated in her survey which had been recommended by the Plans and Policies Committee the preceding year. Dissatisfaction with ACPRA policies and programs was negligible, she reported. Membership in the Association for the year was 804.[115]

Stewart Harral of the University of Oklahoma, named president-elect in 1949, was installed as president for 1950-51 and W. Henry Johnston of Harvard University was chosen as president-elect. Other officers elected were: secretary-treasurer, James W. Armsey, Illinois Institute of Technology; vice presidents, Edward P. VonderHaar, Xavier University (Ohio), membership; Mrs. Smith, regions; John T. Cox, U.S. Naval Academy, athletics; editor of the *Quarterly*, Bradford D. Ansley, Emory University, reelected; editor of the *News Letter*, Louis H. Bell, Pennsylvania State College, reelected; and directors-at-large, Parry D. Sorensen, University of Utah, and William D. Nunn, University of Minnesota. Announcement was made that Alice H. Beeman of the University of Michigan would serve as associate editor of the *Quarterly* with responsibility for the issue devoted to convention proceedings, and that Roy K. Wilson of NEA would continue as business manager of publications.[116]

Through gifts from members of the Association since the Silver Anniversary convention of 1942, the Association had accumulated what was generally referred to as "the endowment fund." By 1950 this had grown to $850, and upon the recommendation of Wendell Kellogg of the University of Bridgeport, chairman of the fund committee, the Board of Directors at Ann Arbor voted to designate it as "The T.T. Frankenberg Endowment Fund of the American College Public Relations Association." At the same time arrangements were made to place the endowment and all additions to it in a trust fund.[117]

Like other Association presidents before him, Ross Bartley sought to inspire his colleagues to long-range thinking and preparation as he spoke on "Public Relations and Educational Policy" in presenting the final address of the convention.

"It is to a role more important than service as a means of communication or as director of thought-traffic that higher education calls us," he said. "It is to the responsibility that we have in the formulation of policy that accords with public interest.

"How worthy are we as public relations representatives to assume this broader undertaking? Mere desire is not enough. Every person on almost every campus, from the dishwasher in the dining hall on up, and including most freshmen, would like to help make policy. In the Association I have heard much discussion of the need for admittance of the college public relations representative to institutional policy-making sessions. This often has led me to wonder whether we know all the whys, wherefores, and consequences of policy making in higher education. Knowledge of how to write a news release, how to pose a picture, how to prepare a booklet, or how to put on a radio program does not in itself qualify one to be a policy maker.

"As educational public relations men and women we need to know more of the philosophy of education and the nature of the elements which are going into the remodeled structure of American higher education. We need to know more and more about the existing problems in higher education. We need to be conversant with the matters facing our presidents and deans.

"Here for example are some of the topics having a public interest that were discussed at the 1950 National Conference on Higher Education: who should go to college, financial aid to students, the student as a factor in his own education, general education, religion in higher education, community responsibilities, national security and freedom in higher education, democracy and efficiency in institutional organization and administration.

"These are some of the subjects involved in higher education policy making today.

"Happily, ACPRA was represented in the discussion of these subjects and called upon to present the public relations implications. The same opportunity came to those of our members invited to participate in the annual sessions of the Association of American Colleges and those invited to serve on the new National Committee on Public Relations. These opportunities seem to me to be the most important step forward in the past year in our field of activities.

"From this beginning educational public relations can and must proceed if its representatives are to meet their full responsibilities. Are we willing and able to make the effort? Presidents, deans, and other administrators in many of our institutions are looking to us to have a public interest. Administrators of other institutions represented in this Association would look to us were we prepared to assume the responsibility. The publics whom we also indirectly serve depend on us to speak when their voices should be heard.

"Therein is the greater role open to us in the drama of higher education in America. Therein is the future opportunity of educational public relations."[118]

A Dream of Years Comes True

A news release of historic importance was issued on plain white paper on September 23, 1950, under the headline "American College Public Relations Association Opens National Office in Washington." The release also announced the appointment of Marvin W. Topping as ACPRA's first executive secretary, although Topping (appointed in August) had already been on the job for three weeks, working at a desk in the offices of the Association of American Colleges on the second floor of the building. In addition, the story sketched the arrangements which had made possible the office's establishment and listed the major objectives of the office: continuance of Association publications, counseling services for members, job placement, and research.

Eight days later—on October 1, 1950—the name of the American College Public Relations Association was placed on the door of Room 502 in the suite occupied by the Association of American Colleges at 726 Jackson Place N.W., less than a block north of the White House. The furniture was moved in on the same day, and Topping and his new secretary, Martha Flowers Kirkpatrick, settled down to work. At long last the dream of a national office for ACPRA had come true.[119]

"To members attending the historic annual conference on June 26-30 at the University of Michigan, the matter of approving the proposal for a national office may have seemed simple, even routine," John DeCamp, chairman of the Central Office Committee, wrote in an article on "Some Family History," "but behind that proposal were years of planning, years of dreaming, periods of setbacks, but always a strong conviction that what ACPRA most needed and surely would have some day was a permanent, central headquarters with paid personnel.

"Although there is new prestige for the Association in its national office in Washington, there is far more than that in the way of practical benefit. In only a year or two from now, it will be hard to understand how a vigorous, service-giving organization like ACPRA ever managed to carry on without such a nerve-center."

As recorded earlier, the movement for a national office started as a brain child of Eleanor Mosely, director of the news bureau at Boston University, in 1938 when she was the newly-elected vice president for research for the Association. By September, she was already able to report to President Graham, who had endorsed her plans, that she had been in personal conference with Guy E. Snavely of the Association of American Colleges. "He is very much interested in the project," she wrote. "He asked me to draw up and present a plan aiming at the allocation of funds for this purpose from the money available to AAC."

"Little did Eleanor realize," DeCamp continued in his article, "how her powers of persistence, patience, and faith would be put to the test when she wrote in the same report, 'if such a plan is drawn up and presented, it will take some time probably to reach a decision'. That 'some time' stretched out to twelve long years, but Eleanor stuck it out, her tenacity stemming from her conviction that not until a central office was established could the Association attain its maximum strength as a service organization."[120]

Miss Mosely did draw the plan Snavely suggested. But the Association of American Colleges, despite the enthusiasm of its executive secretary, could not see its way clear to cooperate on the proposed office at that time. "Persistence and patience have accomplished wonders in the past," Snavely wrote in encouragement. "The same qualities will win out in the plans you have originated and developed for ACPA." That was in 1939.

Miss Mosely served as chairman of the Committee for a Central Office and patiently, hopefully followed through on each lead which she and Association officers believed might help to accomplish their goal. Few leaders of educational associations were as encouraging as Snavely. One suggested that the Association should be satisfied to set up an office staffed only by a secretary and a stenographer. To this Miss Mosely's reply was, "This would be working with a peanut when we should be dealing with a coconut."[121]

Although Mrs. Collier, members of her committees, and the Association's officers explored all possibilities for securing aid for the national office project, they inevitably returned to the Association of American Colleges as the most logical association. "One of the factors recommending AAC most strongly," DeCamp explained, "was the fact that its membership largely paralleled the insitutions represented in ACPRA."

During the final year (1945-46) under its old name (ACPA) and in the years thereafter, ACPRA sought to be of service to the Association of American Colleges in numerous ways. For instance, ACPRA provided the publicity and public relations needed for its annual convention, offered consulting services for its member colleges, and assigned ACPRA's most experienced leaders to membership on the other organization's Commission on Public Relations.

By 1948 the time seemed ripe for a strong bid for assistance. Consequently, Horace Renegar, ACPRA president, wrote to Snavely in support of a special committee named to implement Plans and Policies Committee recommendations concerning a central office. The letter said: "There has been a growing feeling among the leaders of ACPRA that every possible cooperative effort should be made to improve the public relations of America's colleges and universities. We know, of course, that the Association of American Colleges is vitally interested in improving the understanding of higher education among the nation's citizens.

"With this common goal, I am wondering if our two organizations cannot work out some cooperative effort to facilitate better the achievement of these objectives. I am sure that such a cooperative arrangement would meet with the approval and support of our 700 members. If you agree with me that such an arrangement would offer advantages, I shall be glad to follow along any lines which you may suggest for bringing about its acceptance."

Snavely replied with his usual enthusiasm and things began to move slowly but surely toward a contractural arrangement. Early in 1949, President Max Hannum named a committee of five past presidents—Mrs. Collier, Harold Schellenger, Emerson Reck, Arthur Brandon, and DeCamp— to push ahead on the national office project.

AAC's offer of a $6,500 grant followed, but finances still posed a problem, especially when it became known that rent-free space would not be available in the AAC building. Then AAC's directors in January, 1950, offered a $9,000 subsidy, one-third each year for three years, and support for a dues increase by ACPRA. The decision at Ann Arbor to accept AAC's offer and increase dues to $25 finally assured establishment of the national office.

Snavely then came to the rescue by securing from Marts and Lundy a $1,200 gift to apply toward rent. ACPRA had no funds for office equipment, but a $1,000 gift from James Almond, president of the American City Bureau, plus gifts of equipment items from colleges and individuals, helped to meet the major needs of the new office.[122]

How tight the budget of ACPRA promised to be during its first year with a national office can be understood by comparing the proposed budget for 1939-40 with that for 1950-51. When Miss Mosely and her committee drew a budget for the proposed office back in 1939, they arrived at a figure of $17,650, exclusive of rent. Membership at that time was 380. When the plans materialized eleven years later, membership was approximately 800. The budget drawn for 1950-51 totaled $17,490 as follows: National office salaries, $9,600; *News Letter*, $770; *College Public Relations Quarterly*, $2,220; postage, $800; printing and office supplies, $1,-500; travel, $1,200; retirement plan, $300; miscellaneous, including $350 for telephone, $1,100.[123]

In return for the subsidy supplied by the Association of American Colleges, ACPRA had agreed to do the following for that organization: (1) Provide services in the field of public relations; (2) contribute the personal services of its executive secretary in the public relations aspects of programming for the annual meeting and in handling press relations for the meeting; (3) call upon its member or members in cities where the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges was held to give supplementary service in publicizing the meeting; (4) call upon an appropriate member to assist in handling press relations for district meetings; and (5) assist in preparing occasional news releases.

Reporting at the 1951 convention in late June, DeCamp said the central office committee had consulted with Snavely two days earlier and found him "fully satisfied with this working arrangement."[124]

Members of ACPRA likewise were pleased with the first year's activity in the national office. They indicated their satisfaction by praising Topping in a resolution and applauding vigorously the comprehensive report he gave at the convention.

In addition to organizing the office, reorganizing Association records, and taking care of the organizations's financial affairs, Topping during the year had provided a central mailing service for officers and publications of the Association; represented ACPRA at various hearings on educational matters held by Congressional committees; attended conferences of national educational associations and committees as the Association's representative; started to assemble a comprehensive file of documents, proceedings, and other historical information concerning the Association; expanded the Placement Service; prepared the first Association roster with three-way listing—geographical, alphabetical by institution, and alphabetical by representative; initiated steps to establish a loan library, originated a biographical file of ACPRA members; arranged for the production and distribution of a second edition of the *Bibliography of Educational Public Relations* compiled by Cornell's Whitman Daniels two years earlier; served as a clearing house for information concerning the proliferating requests for information from colleges; aided member institutions who had run into difficulties with their mailing permits; and provided various other services.[125]

By no means were all of ACPRA's services and advances during 1950-51 centered in the national office. The Association's publications continued to bring to members materials meant to give them food for thought and inspiration, make them acquainted with new activities and techniques, and keep them informed about their colleagues, district activities, convention plans, and other opportunities for growth.

The *News Letter* continued to give a major share of its space to three popular features—"What Is There to Read?" shorts about current articles and books promising to be of value to Association members; "This and That," a potpourri relating the public relations efforts, articles, and achievements of individuals and institutions; and "For Your Information," a page devoted to personalities. Sometimes a page was inadequate for the personal items, and as much as another page was devoted to them under the head, "News About People You Know." The remainder of the *News Letter* included diverse items ranging from "How to Help Your President" to "Movie Takes" and items from the national office, districts, and the 1951 convention committee.

President Harral in the October 30 issue of the *News Letter* announced the appointed officers for 1950-51: Lynn D. Poole, Johns Hopkins, director for media activities; Franklin B. Skeele, University of Southern California, director for research; Roy K. Wilson, National Education Association, publications business manager; and Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., Mississippi State, Publications Advisory Board member. The listing of Skeele was in error, for the director of research was actually Maynard Morris of the University of California.

ACPRA's Board of Directors at its meeting in December, 1950, took action to reduce the number of questionnaires with which college public relations and publicity officers were beginning to flood each other. All proposed questionnaires, the board decided, would henceforth need to receive the approval of the Association's director of research. Announcement of the action was made in the issue of the *News Letter* for January 18, 1951, and the issue for February 19 reported the first questionnaire to receive approval: one planned by R. L. Dartt, director of public relations at State Teachers College in Montclair, New Jersey. His project called for a study of public relations programs in colleges and professional schools in New Jersey.

The *News Letter* for March 31 brought information that would affect many public relations budgets. Congress was about to pass a bill "readjusting postal rates" upward by as much as 100 percent. Under its provisions "penny" postcards would cost two cents. The cost of mailing second-class matter would jump fifty percent at once and twenty-five percent a year thereafter for two years.

With the nation's military involvement in Korea now full-blown, an increasing number of ACPRA members were again leaving their posts for duty in the armed services. Among a dozen or more involved was Bradford D. Ansley, editor of the *Quarterly*, who had commanded a Navy combat photographic unit in the Pacific as a lieutenant, senior grade, during World War II. His recall came in January, 1951, and the *News Letter* for March 31 announced that Associate Editor Alice Beeman would serve as editor for the remainder of 1950-51. Marvin Black of Mississippi State College, was named associate editor with responsibility for publishing the October issue, annually devoted to coverage of the convention.

Television was much on the minds of ACPRA members in 1950-51, and this relatively new medium of communication received attention in almost every issue of the *News Letter*. The first page of the December 17 issue was devoted entirely to activities of the Joint Committee on Educational Television representing the nation's major educational organizations. The joint committee was seeking to make sure that developing regulations of the Federal Communications Commission would provide adequate opportunity for educational stations and for educational news on commerical stations. In the same issue the *News Letter* announced that NBC's news desk wanted to be placed on college mailing lists to receive items which might be considered for use on approximately thirty programs of educational interest each week.

A month later, on January 18, the *News Letter* reported that nineteen colleges in three states around Philadelphia were joining to provide educational programs for Philadelphia's WFIL-TV five days a week. Programs would range from nuclear physics to English grammar. Contacting television stations in the New York area, the *News Letter* staff learned in February that film coverage of special events on college campuses would be given special consideration. One station director indicated that he had sixty-two programs a week and "needed film coverage badly because of the shortage of incoming news and feature films."

Some of the larger universities, with their public relations officers providing leadership, were beginning to use television as an educational tool, usually to reach adults off campus. Ohio State was sponsoring a ten-week series on "It's Your World," featuring faculty members from the sciences.[126] The University of Michigan was in its third year of cooperation with Detroit's WWJ-TV on programs, which had won the station awards from *Billboard* and *Variety*. As many as 100,000 persons were watching each program, and 2,500 students had paid small fees for six courses on such subjects as Human Biology, Living in Later Years, and Interior Decorating.[127] First to report the use of closed circuit television was Michigan State, where a faculty committee headed by James H. Denison, presidential assistant who would become an ACPRA president a few years later, had worked out the program.[128]

Far out in front of all the country's colleges and universities in the television field, however, was Johns Hopkins University, whose "Science Review" was now in its fourth year with Lynn Poole as writer and director. Poole, director of public relations at Johns Hopkins and later an ACPRA president, captured the coveted George Foster Peabody Award for his work on this show. In addition, it received awards and/or citations from the New York *Times*, *TV Forecast*, and *TV Guide*. The *TV Guide* summarized the sentiment of the various media when it described the Johns Hopkins "Science Review" as "the educational program which has done more to advance television as a public service medium while still providing good entertainment."[129]

When ACPRA members at their 1951 convention gave only one Association award, that for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of higher education, it went to Poole, who had also found time to write a book, *Science via Television*. The citation read in part: "He began to plan while others speculated on television as a medium of mass education. He began to experiment while others planned. He inaugurated what is now the oldest continuously produced education program on TV while others experimented."[130]

When President Harral made a progress report to the membership in the *News Letter* of April 19, he revealed that a committee was being named to compile a history of the Association, now in its thirty-fifth year. "Since our organization has now 'arrived' professionally," he wrote, "I thought it worthwhile for us to have a record of our progress and achievements." William G. Wilcox, director of public relations at Ohio State University, was named chairman of the committee with three past presidents, Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois; Eleanor Mosely Collier, Boston University; and T. T. Frankenberg, Columbus, Ohio, as assistants. The committee worked hard at the task, requesting each past president to write a 2,500-word summary of his administration. At the end of five years, however, only fourteen past presidents had written their summaries and these were turned over for ACPRA's national office files.

Harral also had followed up on the recommendation of the Plans and Policies Committee suggesting a study of possibilities for joint programs and activities with the American Alumni Council. After he and T. Hawley Tapping, president of the Council, had conferred at length, they agreed that "a joint national session of both groups would be impossible and impractical" at this time. "We are of the belief that various districts of both organizations can work out something which will be mutually profitable to members of the Council and ACPRA . . . . I am quite sure that both groups can move along together in the years ahead."

By the time ACPRA held its 1951 convention, the American Alumni Council had a new president, Charles P. McCurdy, Jr., of the College of William and Mary, and he delivered one of the major addresses.

"Often we have heard it observed," McCurdy declared, "that the objectives of the American College Public Relations Association and those of the American Alumni Council are, in many respects, parallel. This truism is scarcely in need of further elaboration. Our differences are in approach. You have the larger field. Ours is perhaps more intimate. The scope of your operation is unlimited. You address the public at large. We have the restriction whereby we are prone to think that our concern is not the public at all, but the family. Very frequently we have matters which can be discussed only within the family. This is not so with you. But basically, we are both engaged in the same business. We are both trying to sell the same product—higher education in this country as we know and love it."

Some apprehension in ACPRA ranks had been created earlier. McCurdy was reported as saying at Harvard that the division then existing between public relations officials and alumni officials would come to an end, possibly with the alumni operation superceding the public relations program.

"I did say it,"McCurdy told the ACPRA delegates, "But I added that we would learn that our public relations program would more and more be geared not only to the needs of the institution but to the fulfillment of those needs by the alumni. There was no concern then or now, expressed or implied, over one putting the other out of business. There was only a concern for a much needed reevaluation of our joint program that we might both raise our sights to better levels, forsaking the trivial for the important, and recognizing that certainly for most of us it will be our alumni—the family itself—whose influence and support we must garner to an extent not yet known.

"Perhaps we shall merge forces and do the job together. Perhaps we shall do it separately. It only matters that we produce. It is going to require of either or both of us a new vision and a stronger courage. Unless we have it and display it, it is my opinion that we shall lose both stature and status."[131]

Before returning to the Navy, Editor Ansley had inaugurated a new feature, "Here's How We Do It," in the Association's magazine. The first article was written by Eleanor Collier, who not only detailed the workings of Boston University's news bureau but added a paragraph summarizing the major requirements she believed essential for success in publicity and public relations offices.

"One of our biggest jobs," wrote Mrs. Collier from a vantage point reached through nearly two decades in leadership positions, "is to be sure that we correlate each other's information, that we do not waste manpower by unnecessary duplication of time and energy, that we combine forces wherever and whenever possible, that we move in a *forward* direction at all times, and that we *plan ahead*. Three quarters of successful public relations and publicity is planning. And this may mean for several years. The catch-as-catch-can policy may pay off temporarily, but the solid, substantial long-range viewpoint is the most productive. Immediate results may not always show, but if the planning *and follow through* are sound and consistent, ultimate achievement will be very obvious. Some other part of the university will always receive the credit, but that is as it should be. If public relations work is to be successful, the public relations man will lose his identity between the origin and the completion of a project."[132]

A plea for unity between education and industry, a plea which would become increasingly strong with each succeeding year, was made by James Armsey, ACPRA's secretary-treasurer, in a lead article in the *Quarterly*. "Industry is thwarted and coerced by regulations, controls, government-sponsored red tape, and attacked ceaselessly by misinformed benefactors of the system they seek to destroy," Armsey wrote in an article titled "Education and Industry Must Unite." "The threat of what has been variously described, but often aptly termed 'creeping socialism', is the cause of many a businessman's frustration and insomnia.

"Education, on the other hand, is plagued by declining enrollments and revenues and spiraling costs: a problem most serious for privately-supported colleges and universities. Educators foresee defeat in their fight to preserve the historical balance between state-supported and privately-endowed education.

"To resolve the plight of industry and education is the gravest task these two groups have ever faced. It will require not only insight and understanding but cooperation where it means most: in dollar support for education."[133]

One of the articles appearing in the *Quarterly* bore the byline of G. Duncan Wimpress, director of public relations at Whittier College. Wimpress later would become president of three institutions—Monticello College, Monmouth (Illinois) College, and Trinity University of Texas. The subject of his article in the *Quarterly* was "Organizing the Small College PR Office."

"It is generally agreed," said Wimpress, "that the overall purpose should be to build, in every way possible, good will for the institution. Every public relations project should be evaluated in the light of this general objective. . . .

"If the small college president wants the greatest possible service from his director of public relations," Wimpress continued, "he will avoid the common pitfall of heaping duties other than public relations upon the director's shoulders. This tendency among college presidents is probably the greatest single deterrent to success in small college public relations."[134]

Medical school public relations, the crisis in the college fraternity, research in public relations, public relations films, alumni magazine editing, radio public relations, college responsibility for student welfare, internal relations, and high school relations were included in the variety of subjects discussed in other full-length articles in the *Quarterly*. Still one of the most popular features of the magazine, however, was "Public Relations at Work," a seven-to-ten-page section devoted to case studies on such subjects as broadcasting services, student manners, public relations clinics, student recruitment, newsletters, and handling "bad" news.

When the 1950 convention adjourned at Ann Arbor, it was expected that the 1951 convention would be held at Miami Beach, Florida. The Association had a stipulation however, that there be no segregation among delegates. A decision not to hold future conventions in locations where segregation would prevent some ACPRA members from participating had been made four years earlier. By October 15 Miami Beach appeared unlikely for the convention even if the problem of segregation were solved. Only ninety-nine of 525 members answering a mail inquiry had given definite assurance of attendance. On November 17, however, the *News Letter* announced that the officers had decided to proceed with plans for Miami Beach, the Hotel Floridian having guaranteed open housing. Dates for the convention, June 27-30, were set at a meeting of the Board of Directors December 5. The program would follow the seminar plan established at Ann Arbor. Registration was to be no more than $20 for members, $25 for nonmembers. Edward D. Whittlesey, ACPRA president in 1941-42 and now director of public relations at the University of Florida, would be convention director responsible for physical arrangements, and Horace Renegar of Tulane, also a past president, would head a committee of ten responsible for the program.[135]

Following a tradition established in the early 1940s, the immediate past president, E. Ross Bartley, was selected to deliver the keynote address. Using as his subject "United in the Service of Education," the slogan adopted by the Association in 1940, Bartley declared, "If there is any one thing about which we as members of this Association should be concerned, both from the standpoint of the organization and as individuals in our daily work, it is this principle which we profess to follow."

Unity in service should be emphasized at this time, Bartley declared, because the American system of higher education was on trial—on trial as opposed to another foreign ideology, and on trial for financial support.

"The international and the national situation should be a matter of deep and particular concern for all interested in American higher education," Bartley asserted. "The situations faced are those common in varying degrees in all of our respective institutions. They present a common problem for a national association such as the American College Public Relations Association. Neither this Association nor any other alone can provide the solution. But if we are 'united in the service of higher education' we can aid, and aid importantly.

"The time has come when we as experts, as we feel we are, in public relations must begin thinking and acting more and more in behalf of higher education as a system. All too long we have thought and acted largely in behalf of our respective institutions. We have our obligations to our own institutions; but we also have an obligation now as never before to all institutions."[136]

Seminars for the convention were organized in four general areas: specific media—publications, radio, television, the press, record albums, and films; on-campus relations—student guidance, nonacademic staff, faculty-administration, and student-faculty; off-campus relations—pre-admission, alumni, fund raising, and community relations; and athletics.

Reports of the officers, like those of Executive Secretary Marvin Topping, indicated that the Association had had a year of great progress, although not of growth in all areas. The Korean war, declining enrollments, budgeting, and the sixty-seven percent increase in dues had had an adverse effect on membership. Despite the efforts of Edward VonderHaar, vice president for membership, and his forty-eight-member committee, the membership had dropped from the 804 of the preceding year to 773, although this total rose to 778 before the fiscal year ended.[137]

As usual in recent years, all districts had held meetings. This year they benefited from a manual, *Suggestions for District Activities*, prepared by President-elect W. Henry Johnston while he was vice president for regions the year before. As recommended by the Plans and Policies Committee of the Association, programs had been built around seminars and planned with the special interests of newcomers in mind. Five of the districts were now publishing newsletters for their membership.[138]

By approving recommendations made by its ad hoc Committee on Educational Directories, ACPRA at Miami Beach took a step toward obtaining accuracy and consistency in figures used by the many organizations and firms publishing so-called educational directories. To the embarassment of colleges trying to cooperate, figures for costs and enrollment had often varied in these directories because the questionnaires lacked uniformity. Ten recommendations made by the committee not only listed steps through which uniformity could be achieved by inquiring firms and organizations, but also urged institutions "to list accurately and separately their tuition fee and general fee" and "to show total number of students, using the fall enrollment as the basic figure with subdivisions showing full-time, part-time, and extension students." The committee also urged that institutions handle through one office, preferably that of the director of public relations, all questionnaires seeking cost and enrollment figures. Efforts were being made to get a complete list of educational directories in order to make responsible parties acquainted with the problems of inaccuracy and the procedures suggested for their elimination.[139]

Committees whose reports received greatest attention at Miami Beach were those on plans and policies headed by Eleanor Collier and on mutual cooperation headed by Emerson Reck. Major recommendations of the former included: establishment of an Association committee to work with the director of media activities in a thorough analysis of television problems and opportunities; analysis, for the use of college administrators, of college public relations budgets with respect both to salary standards and to the status of public relations officers in the college organization; wider sale of ACPRA professional materials, especially through reprints offered at special rates to college classes and other groups; enlargement of the circulating library through the cooperation of individual members; fuller, more comprehensive printing of the annual convention proceedings (since 1949 provided in greatly condensed form as an issue of the *Quarterly*); appointment of a Finance Committee which would make a study of Association income and expenses, then advise concerning possible new income and possible reduction of expenses; inauguration of an informational campaign meant to acquaint members with the need for enlarging the T. T. Frankenberg Endowment Fund; and formation of a Past Presidents Cabinet to make wider use of "the great reservoir of experience and information possessed by the Association's past presidents."

"Opportunities, apparent and potential, for mutual cooperation in the field of college public relations are endless," the Committee on Mutual Cooperation said in opening its report. "Only by taking full advantage of these opportunities can ACPRA implement its slogan, 'United in the Service of Higher Education'. And only when every effort is being made to implement the slogan will college public relations and ACPRA itself reach full maturity."

The committee then made detailed recommendations for cooperation among ACPRA members and sister organizations and secondary schools, groups using campus facilities, denominational and vocational groups, educational organizations and associations of college personnel, colleges establishing public relations courses, placement services of denominational groups, and other public relations organizations. "Implementing the recommendations," the committee concluded, "will give real emphasis to the teamwork stressed in every worthwhile public relations effort."[140]

Also in their business session, the delegates conferred an honorary life membership upon Guy E. Snavely, executive secretary of AAC, who had for many years been an active supporter of ACPRA and its work.

W. Henry Johnston of Harvard was installed as president for 1951-52 and the following officers were elected: President-elect, Edward P. VonderHaar, Xavier University, Cincinnati; vice presidents, Louis H. Bell, Pennsylvania State College, membership; Marvin G. Osborn, Mississippi State College, districts; and Joe Sherman, University of Florida, athletics; secretary-treasurer, Lynn Poole; editor of *College Public Relations Quarterly*, Alice L. Beeman, re-elected; and editor, ACPRA *News Letter*, Francis C. Pray, Hofstra College. Edward H. Stromberg, Northwestern University, and Veta Lee Smith, Marshall College, were named directors-at-large, and W. Barton Beatty, Jr., Hampton Institute, was elected to the Publications Advisory Board. Robert Bishop, Trinity College, was appointed business manager of publications, and Cleveland was chosen as the 1952 convention city.[141]

The final address at the convention was delivered by President Harral. ACPRA was fortunate to have Harral as its president during this landmark year because he was widely known among educators and large segments of the general Association. Harral in the last ten years had written four books on public relations and edited a fifth. In addition, he had written more than fifty magazines articles, most of them on subjects related to education. Harral's greatest recognition, however, had come as a public speaker and by 1951 he had given more than 2,000 addresses in twenty-six states and Canada. While most of his 100 or more addresses each year were in a serious vein, he was also well known for his humor. The study of humor, its development, psychology, and trends, had long been a hobby of his, and he had appeared in fourteen states as a toastmaster or after-dinner speaker.[142]

In ACPRA Harral had, since 1938, held a dozen committee assignments and served as a contributing or associate editor of the magazine, editor of the annual proceedings (1940), vice president for regions, and vice president for research. Addressing his colleagues now on "Of Media and Men," Harral emphasized the principle that people always come first in public relations.

"After everything else has been considered," he asked, "isn't it a feeling for people, a combination of curiosity and concern for them, which separates the so-called mediocre public relations worker from the master? . . . No matter how many techniques you master, no matter how many research findings you pack into your skull—these things will have to be applied subjectively. Your overall programs will be only as good as and no better than you yourself as a thinking, analytical, imaginative, understanding, and sympathetic human being.

"Not long ago I read that it is easier to tell what makes a second-rate public relations director than what makes a first-rate director, because the things that make the first-class practitioner are intangible. They can't be cataloged like vitamins. They are over and above techniques which can be described . . . they must be experienced. . . .

"Here's something else: we have relied much too exclusively on gathering data on what people think (or believe they are supposed to think) instead of studying the emotional forces behind their thinking. Opinion polls are significant but they are not the tool for understanding the forces operating underneath the surface of opinion. . . .

"Many of our difficulties, both on the campus and in extended services, flow from a confusion of synonyms; a failure to distinguish between bigness and greatness, price and value, success and achievement, a standard of living and a standard of life."[143]

Approximately 200 attended the first Florida convention. A few stayed over to go deep sea fishing. The prize catch was a 200-pound blue marlin, measuring nine feet one inch and appropriately hooked by Ed Whittlesey's ten-year-old son. Whittlesey, Horance Renegar, Jim Armsey, Ed VonderHaar, and Bill Keys of the University of Texas gave eager assistance. Twenty pounds of smoked fish later reached each of the fishermen and some special friends.[144]

7

The Association Faces New Problems

The University Under Fire

To W. Henry Johnston (1951-52) belongs the honor of being the only person ever selected from the athletic public relations field to serve as president of the American College Public Relations Association. Several presidents in the years before 1951-52, notably Edmund S. Carpenter (1929-30), Robert W. Madry (1933-34), J. Willard Ridings (1941-42), and Horace Renegar (1947-48), had been heavily involved in sports work but Johnston, as director of sports information at Harvard University, devoted full time to public relations for his institution's Department of Athletics.

Although he specialized in sports, Johnston had had wide experience in the broader areas of public relations while associated with his alma mater, Lawrence College, Indiana University, and Colgate University before going to Harvard. He had also proved his ability as an administrator while serving on major ACPRA committees and as an Association officer—vice president for athletics, vice president for research, and vice president for membership—over a six-year span.

Administrative leadership was especially important to ACPRA in this period when the fast-growing Association was still getting its national office organized, undertaking broader services to members and sister organizations, and implementing dozens of recommendations made by its Plans and Policies Committee.

One of Johnston's first steps, and one which promised to be especially beneficial to the Association, was the assignment of Edward P. VonderHaar, the president-elect, to the task of taking an inventory of past operations. This assignment called for VonderHaar to examine resolutions and recommendations passed at conventions and directors' meetings of the preceding decade to determine whether action had been taken on each proposal and if not why not. In other words, Johnston determined that no plans or recommended procedures were to lie dormant through lack of follow-up by his or some previous administration.

A corollary of this action during the Johnston administration called for the clarification of several fundamental procedures—for instance, how to utilize most effectively the reports of various advisory groups and committees, especially those of the Plans and Policies Committee whose work had been of special benefit to the Association since its creation during 1944-45, the first year of Arthur Brandon's administration.[1]

It was also during the Johnston administration that ACPRA began to project convention plans two years in advance; moved to make the fast-growing Medical Section an offical division of the Association; gave increased attention to the problems of fund raising as a public relations activity, and completed the most fully-organized membership campaign yet held.

As a group, ACPRA was facing some of its greatest challenges because 1951-52 was a crisis year for higher education. Ironically for Johnston, one of the major crises grew from a series of athletic scandals which rocked several colleges to their foundations. At the same time critics of higher education, leaders from business and industry especially, were branding colleges and universities as "hot beds of Communism," and college teachers as "all theory and no common sense." To make matters still worse, the Korean war was causing a large drop in enrollment while simultaneously creating inflation that played havoc with institutional budgets.

Johnston had warned five years earlier at ACPRA's Lexington convention that intercollegiate athletics would get out of hand if not controlled by the president and faculty. Now he tried by writing and speaking to guide the colleges and their athletic programs out of the morass created by the scandals and general disgust with the overemphasis on sports.

"There is no excuse for a good many of the practices which have been going on . . . in recent years . . . and intercollegiate athletics in general have been dealt an undeserved and staggering blow," wrote Johnston, whose own athletic career had been ended by a broken leg in high school. "This is because too many college administrations either have been careless or have been afraid to insist on sanity in the conduct of their programs. Some claim they are too busy. Being busy is no excuse. That is the same type of reasoning given by some parents for not knowing what their children are up to."[2]

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was presenting proposals and enacting legislation designed to eliminate existing evils. The college presidents had finally gotten around to scrutinizing the situation. Various conferences were also acting. But agreement was far from unanimous.

"The NCAA can vote rules and its members can make agreements; the various conferences can set up regulations, and I am all for such cooperative measures," Johnston declared. "But in the long run *the only real protection intercollegiate athletics has is the degree of moral and ethical responsibility found in each individual institution*. Any of us who is fortunate enough to be able to attend or be employed by a college knows the difference between right or wrong. It is as simple as that."

Johnston suggested four things public relations directors could and should do to be of help with the problem: "(1) Become fully informed of the place, purpose, and aims of intercollegiate athletics in our own institutions; (2) completely understand, fully subscribe to, and help protect the policies adopted by our colleges; (3) defend the colleges and intercollegiate athletics from the ruthless attacks of the sensational-minded, and emphasize the good in college athletics; (4) and, most important of all, reaffirm our faith in the fundamentals of honesty and integrity."[3]

The growing concern of ACPRA members with fund raising had shown itself in several ways in recent years, but especially through the attention given to the subject in Association publications and at district and national conventions. Now for the first time a major part of one issue of the Association's quarterly magazine was devoted to articles related to public relations and fund raising.

"For public relations people perhaps the most significant factor in this whole topic of fund raising and financial security for education is that the problem is a long-range one and that to be successful in solving it, education must adopt long-range public relations efforts," Editor Alice Beeman wrote in the editorial, "Money Is Everybody's Problem," introducing the magazine's fund-raising emphasis.

"Although current fund-raising programs may be bringing in more money for education than ever before," she continued, "there is also in this country a rising clamor of criticism and of attack upon all levels of education, including the colleges and the universities. The portion of this criticism which is justified must be accepted by education and corrections made; that which is unwarranted must be stilled or discredited by interpretation of education's true functions and achievements to its various publics if increased public support, financial and otherwise, is to be received. The fundamental work of interpretation of education and of the public's needs and expectations from education must not be neglected in the immediacy of fund-raising campaigns."[4]

"In the financing of higher education," wrote Louis Lundberg, vice president of the Bank of America and formerly a vice president at Stanford University, in the lead article of the fund-raising issue of the *Quarterly*, "there are really only two questions: Do people have money? And, if they do, do they want higher education enough to buy it, have enough confidence in it to invest in it, or believe in it enough to give to it? If you can answer 'Yes' to those questions . . . then financing is no problem at all. But if you can't, then you have a problem; but it is not a *financing* problem—it's a *public relations* and *selling* problem."

Lundberg, who had been in charge of Stanford's fund-raising efforts, emphasized that public relations people could not do the job of selling their institutions alone.

"You need everyone, every part of your college in on the game," he said, "but no one else but you can ever be expected to have the vision of what this human relations job is, nor to have the time, energy, or ability to plan how everyone's part of this game shall dovetail together.

"Yours is more of a job, perhaps, than you realize. I'm sure it is more than many of your bosses realize. I know this is primer stuff—you've said it yourselves many times—but it hasn't been said too many times yet: that your money problems can't be licked by a Board of Trustees saying 'We're going to raise a million dollars', and then turning to the president—or the president turning to the development chief—and saying, 'Boy, you go out and raise a million dollars'. To send someone out with an order book, without all the ground-work and all the follow-through that we call public relations, is like sending a foot soldier out on a modern battlefield with no artillery or air support."[5]

"What Will Happen in 1965?" was the subject of a second article in the fund-raising edition of the *Quarterly*. Written by Harold N. Lee, professor of philosophy at Newcomb College, Tulane University, the article emphasized that the greatest change facing higher education lay in the greatly increased number of students who would be going to college in the near future.

"By 1965, there will be nearly a million more students in college than there were at the peak of the GI's," Lee warned. "Two of the major problems that will arise from the large enrollments will be inadequate physical plant and facilities and insufficient number of teachers. To solve or even partly solve either of these problems will take a great deal of money, and the colleges and universities will have to direct their public relations more and more toward getting money. The public relations people may as well get ready for this."

Concluding, Lee said: "The future of higher education in the United States is in the hands of educational public relations personnel, perhaps to a greater extent than it is comfortable for you to contemplate. It is up to you as much as, if not more than, to anyone else to bring home to the people of the United States that if they want universal education and higher education for those able to profit from it, they will have to pay for it."[6]

This was also a pioneering year in the fund-raising field because colleges, realizing that in unity there was strength, were beginning to work cooperatively in state organizations. The first issue of ACPRA *News Letter* for 1951-52, dated September 30, announced that nineteen private colleges in Ohio had incorporated as the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges (OFIC) to seek the support of corporations, business, and individuals on a "one-appeal, one-gift" platform. Secondary aim of the colleges, according to Harold K. Schellenger, former ACPRA president named executive director of OFIC, would be interpretation of private education to the public.

In an article in the issue of the *Quarterly* devoted to fund raising, Schellenger gave a full explanation of OFIC, which had been organized formally in December, 1950, after months of planning by the college presidents. The Ohio undertaking was inspired by the presidents of several Indiana colleges, who had with good results been going out in pairs to present the needs of their institutions to industrial leaders. The Indiana association, however, did not organize formally until March, 1952. Meanwhile, the Minnesota College Fund Association had been organized in 1951.[7]

The OFIC, which was to furnish the pattern for nearly forty similar associations during the next twenty-five years, was a success from the start. It raised $190,865 during its initial year and a total of $28,890,922 by 1975. Schellenger continued as its executive director for seventeen years. Attention was focused on the OFIC again during ACPRA's 1952 convention when fund raising was also discussed in seminars on the alumni fund, the special campaign, and the long-range development program.[8]

By this time individual colleges were beginning to plan workshops on fund raising. The first one mentioned in the *News Letter* was held at Pennsylvania State College July 21 to August 9, 1952, under the direction of Bernard P. Taylor, professional fund-raising consultant. Designed for fund directors, public relations directors, alumni secretaries, and other administrative officers interested in the problem, it offered, for a $50 fee, instruction in annual giving programs, capital gift campaigns, long-term development programs, and deferred giving (bequests, insurance, and annuity plans).[9]

Francis Pray, editor of ACPRA's *News Letter* during 1951-52, had the attitude that his job should be a lot of fun and in the process provide a light touch welcome to Association members in the midst of serious workaday duties.

"Ideas and hints and hunches, new promotion programs, gossip of the profession, will predominate [in its content]," Pray wrote in his first issue. "Here we will be friends together, none too good to admit a mistake (especially if it be humorous), none too modest to mind sharing an idea if it is a good one, none backward about criticism if it is constructive."[10]

Breezy headlines—"Get in, stay in, with tie-ins," "Idea a day and twice on holidays," "Coed of the month—a satisfying choice," "Gosh, you guys and gals are working too hard," "Because pa went there, and so did ma"—led readers into a potpourri of items selected to be of help to the largest number of readers. Soon one or more cartoons guaranteed to produce at least a smile—a galloping pony (the president tells his PRD to 'go ahead'), an ape round-shouldered and bent slouching off into the horizon (PR man whose pet idea has been rejected by the president)—began appearing in each issue.

Another Pray innovation was "The Distillery," in which the editor asked a veteran member to "distill a lifetime of experience into one paragraph of advice" for the newcomer in the profession. Typical was the "distillation" from Edmund S. Carpenter, ACPRA president in 1929-30: "Look to your contacts, on the campus and off! Know your school, inside and out, forward and backward—its history, its traditions, its administration and faculty, its students. Meet people and like them—the editors, the leg men, the firemen and the chief, the merchant, the mayor, and all possible who make up the publics of your institution. Ability to think, to create, to talk, and to write are vital in this field, of course, but equally important are your contacts. Get them—and keep them!"[11]

Pray also gave space to readers who believed their institutions had been the first to give recognition to the values of a public relations program. To Trennie Eisley, director of public relations at Bucknell University, went the last word when she wrote: "Evidently Bucknell's founders were public relations conscious, too, for the original charter, approved February 5, 1846, instructed the curators as follows: 'Finally, the curators shall every year publish, in at least three papers, having extensive circulation, in different parts of this commonwealth, such a statement of the result of their observations as they shall reckon due to the university and to its patrons and friends'."[12]

Again, many colleges were losing their public relations officers to the armed forces and government, and in not a few instances the jobs were going begging. The *News Letter* helped by giving information about available positions under heads like "A couple of jobs looking for people" and "Here are at least $32,000 worth of positions open." Salaries mentioned, in this day when only a handful of college people were receiving as much as $10,000, ranged from $2,750 to $12,000.[13]

Through W. Robert Brossman of Cornell University, who had been appointed director of media activities when Lynn Poole assumed the post of secretary-treasurer for ACPRA, the *News Letter* brought its readers a series of informative items on free-lance writers willing to consider college material and on magazines desiring information and pictures. Many colleges at this time were being solicited, sometimes with pressure, for advertising in "educational supplements" or in publications, often created primarily for the revenue they promised for their sponsors. From members of experience with these schemes, the *News Letter* brought advice, and the revelation that in Texas and Kansas at least, state colleges were prohibited by law to use money for paid advertising.[14]

Three appointments reported in the *News Letter*, in addition to Brossman's, helped bring to the front men whose names would be included among those of ACPRA leaders for many years. Growing responsibilities with the NEA had made it impossible for Roy K. Wilson to continue as business manager of publications, a position he had held since 1941, except for a brief leave for war duty. Robert Bishop of Trinity College (Connecticut) took his place and in November W. Lowell Treaster of Michigan State was appointed director for research. In March, President Johnston named Howard A. Keyo of the University of Maine as associate editor of the *Quarterly* with responsibility for the October issue devoted to convention proceedings.

Editor Pray ran as the final item in the *News Letter* for April 1 this one about himself: "The University of Pittsburgh has announced appointment of Francis C. Pray, assistant to the president at Hofstra College, to the newly-created position of public relations counselor. He will coordinate and direct public relations and promotion activities of the university after joining the Pittsburgh staff July 1."

In his first issue of the *News Letter* for 1951-52, Pray had reported that Stewart Harral, immediate past president of ACPRA, had assumed the newly-created office of director of public relations studies and professor of journalism at the University of Oklahoma where he had been director of public relations for fifteen years.[15]

A few months later the *News Letter* reported recognition of differing types for two other ACPRA officers, President-elect VonderHaar and Secretary-Treasurer Poole. While VonderHaar was attending a conference of ACPRA's District VIII, Governor Val Peterson of Nebraska had presided at ceremonies making the president-elect an "Honorary Admiral in the Great Nebraska Navy."

Of a more serious nature was the recognition coming to Poole. His pioneering in television had brought him an invitation from the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) to produce three science shows in its London studios. He would be leaving April 22 and film recordings of the BBC programs would be brought to the United States for airing over the Dumont network.[16]

When ACPRA's Board of Directors held its winter meeting, it decided that the rule adopted in 1950 requiring members to get approval of the director for research before circulating questionnaires to the membership would be unworkable. The board consequently voted that ACPRA "not propose to approve or disapprove the value of research projects, but that the director of research shall ask the cooperation of ACPRA members only in those projects which he believes of specific value to the Association."

The board at this meeting gave considerable time to discussing the Plans and Policies Committee and defining its function. The preamble to the first report of the committee in 1946 had stated: "This committee was appointed by President Brandon (1) to give members an opportunity for a large voice in the Association's activities, and (2) to make certain that no opportunity for improving the Association and its services be overlooked." The committee had now been operative for nearly seven years and Eleanor Collier, its current chairman, had suggested the study of its origin, function, and values. Out of this discussion came the following board action:

"In a spirit of appreciation of the services of this committee, the board defines the nature and function of the committee as follows: (1) That the Plans and Policies Committee, following appointment by the president, conduct informal surveys of opinions and attitudes of the membership with regard to broad policies in preparation for its annual report with the purpose of discovering the general attitude and opinion of the general membership on questions which should merit the serious consideration of the board; (2) that the committee submit its report to the Board of Directors which in turn will present it to the general assembly in convention for such discussion as may aid the board in its later deliberations on items included in the report."[17]

Among more than twenty articles which touched on a wide variety of subjects in the *Quarterly* in 1951-52, one by Julian A. McPhee, president of California State Polytechnic College, gave a penetrating analysis of "Blind Spots in Educational Public Relations."

"The most serious blind spot, in my opinion," wrote McPhee, "has been the failure of educators and educational public relations people to drive home to the public, through every channel at their disposal, the basic fundamental purpose of their particular institutions."[18]

The extracurricular had been emphasized to the detriment of the curricular, according to McPhee. In his opinion, many people were at fault—editors, alumni, students, college presidents, and college public relations people.

"Since the president is by virtue of his position the chief public relations representative for any college or university, he must," McPhee asserted, "accept the final responsibility for any failure of his public relations program. . . . The public relations programs of our colleges and universities would never have shot off on the tangent of misplaced emphasis had the presidents known exactly what they wanted from their public relations programs from the very beginning. . . .

"We have finally matured in our public relations thinking. We realize now that publicity is just one small, although important part of a public relations program. Our problem is to grow up even more, and overcome other blind spots in educational public relations. There are, I believe, three main steps which must be taken to overcome these blind spots.

"(1) The college president must place the person charged with public relations on a policy-making level. The public relations director should be present at all policy-making sessions—it is unimportant whether he has a vote—but he must have a voice. . . .

"(2) The college must develop a good system of internal communications. By and large academic administrators have yet to learn the crucial significance in staff morale of good systems of internal communications. . . .

"(3) Finally, you must establish and carry out a program interpreting the real educational purpose of your college, using every medium which you believe will effectively reach the specific publics you hope to influence favorably. . . .

"The future of educational public relations," McPhee concluded, "depends upon how well each of you can sell the educational process itself. It never has been and never can be over-sold. But as a product, it has been misrepresented with emphasis placed on selling the 'sizzle' instead of the 'steak'."[19]

With the approval of ACPRA, Gilbert O. Maienknecht, director of the news bureau at Central Michigan College, made during 1951-52 a study of public relations organization and functions in colleges and universities for his doctoral dissertation. He reported his findings through the *Quarterly*. From the 355 persons replying to his questionnaire, Maienknecht learned that eighty-five different titles were being used by persons administering programs. About fifty percent held the title of director of public relations. Ninety-four percent were directly responsible to their presidents.

Maienknecht found that preparing publications and directing both a news bureau and athletic publicity were still the chief functions of public relations efforts conducted on an organized basis. Fifty-nine percent of his respondents devoted full time to their public relations activities and most of those having other duties taught classes, journalism in most cases. Only seventy-eight percent of the respondents said they had definite budgets for their offices.

Principal conclusions made by Maienknecht were that the public relations director should be a member of his institution's policy-making body and be responsible for all public relations functions; that public relations programs should be conducted on a continuous basis rather than on an academic calendar basis; and that public relations offices generally needed better staffing and definite budgets.[20]

Planning for ACPRA's 1952 convention started before the officers left Florida after the 1951 convention. The issue of the *News Letter* for November 15 announced that the theme for the meeting, to be held at Cleveland's Hotel Carter on April 16-18, would be "Education, Business and Industry, Partners for Community Progress." Four institutions in the Cleveland area cooperated in the planning, with A. W. Quattrochi of Western Reserve University serving as convention director and Douglass W. Miller, now at Case Institute of Technology, serving as program director. Attendance for the convention set another record. Three hundred seventy-two persons registered for a program that included only five addresses, followed by panel discussions on "Current Criticisms of Higher Education" and "Current Manpower Problems." Twenty-three seminars, four of them related to higher education's relations with industry, were also featured. Nearly 100 persons took part in the panels and seminars.

Implementing a recommendation made by the Plans and Policies Committee in 1951, the Association gave members much more extensive coverage of the convention's program features. ACPRA published a 100-page book, *Membership Directory and Annual Reports, 1952*, in addition to devoting the October issue of the *Quarterly* to the meeting. Through the work of thirty recorders the *Quarterly* gave thorough coverage to speeches, panels, and seminars. Half of the new directory was devoted to convention reports made by officers and committees. The other half included rosters, statistical tables, and information on committee memberships and past national meetings never previously gathered in one publication.

Bringing industry's viewpoint before the convention, Don Knowlton, partner in Hill and Knowlton, a New York public relations firm, gave a hard-hitting address which echoed the political atmosphere of the day. He declared that corporations had been doing less than expected for higher education because colleges and universities were "getting the kind of publicity that gets them in wrong with the very people from whom they hope to get money.

"They are," he continued, "getting the kind of publicity that leads so many industries to say that colleges are full of cockeyed economics, socialism, and collectivism, and are not entitled to one nickel of support.

"This is a public relations problem, and that's why I am talking to you about it today. It has to do with the *impression* colleges have created among the public and among the industrialists, in the newspapers, over the radio, etc."

While granting that academic freedom must be preserved, Knowlton said that he questioned the avisability of exercising it "quite so strenuously today on what industrialists consider the wrong side of the fence."

"It seems to me a question," he said, "as to whether, *as a matter of policy*, academic freedom should hold a protective umbrella over special pleading on behalf of a system which, if successful, would destroy academic freedom. . . .

"University trustees," Knowlton continued, "are always fond of explaining that socialistic convictions expressed publicly by professors do not represent the policy of the university. As public relations men, you know as well as I do that this contention appears absolutely ridiculous. A university gets its reputation from the people who appear publicly in print. If the management of a university tolerates these public expressions, the logical conclusion to be arrived at is that the management is in sympathy with them.

"Industrialists do not want to put money into what they consider unsound educational management, any more than they would put money into unsound business management."

Knowlton warned that unless industrial financial support of education was forthcoming to a much greater extent than in the past, colleges and universities would be forced to turn to government.

"Once colleges become completely dependent upon government, under a socialistic system which so many professors now recommend, what is going to become of academic freedom?" he asked. "What has been the history of academic freedom in countries under socialized or collectivist governments?"

Knowlton told the delegates that "everybody expects a divergency of opinion among the college teaching staff. Nobody is going to be surprised if you have a few radicals. The trouble today is that they get the impression they are *all* radicals. . . .

"I'm pounding this home to you because this is a public relations situation. I say if you've got some socialists, if you've got some Keynesians, let them talk. Let's keep academic freedom. But *get your conservatives out front to balance them*. See if you can't give the public in your publicity a *truly representative* picture of the university. If you don't you are going to have rough sledding ahead."[21]

In another convention address Kenneth Patrick, manager of the general public relations service, General Electric Company, discussed "The Square Root of Understanding," which he said is "intelligent, increasing effort on the part of the person or the organization that wants to be understood. It is," he continued, "telling the truth, promptly and honestly and completely, in times of conflicting views and emotions, in times of embarrassment and humiliation. It is also getting your principal to tell the truth—on time. It is probably the ability not to be a bore, not to be dishonest, not to be a tiresome fanatic, not to mistake material things for universal values. . . .

"The important thing is the principal himself—individual, company, or college—what he does every day, how he lives, and whether he has behaved himself over a long period. You just can't hire reputation and character for a fee, or create them with one or two stories. A good reputation has to be deserved—it can't be put up over night like a circus tent."[22]

As a panel of four explored current criticism of higher education, Stewart Smith, president of Marshall College, declared that "the present lack of confidence in education is partly our own fault [because] we have not been frank enough in admitting our difficulties and explaining our problems." He recommended four steps to help meet current criticisms:

"First, we must dedicate ourselves to seeking greater public understanding, sympathy, and support for higher education by talking to our people, individually and in groups, about our real problems. . . . Second, we must defend the cause of education against unjust attacks. Let us investigate all charges thoroughly. We dare not be silent in defending the right and condemning the wrong, or hesitant in correcting our weaknesses. . . . Third, it is essential that we have more cooperation and less competition among our colleges and universities. . . . Fourth, feeling that academic freedom is essential in American education, we must explain it in terms that the lay public can understand, if we expect them to support it."[23]

ACPRA by convention time was heading for a new membership record, 878—a gain of 100—by the end of the fiscal year. A totally new type of campaign set up by Louis H. Bell, vice president for membership, was responsible. Bell not only named a membership chairman for each state, District of Columbia, Canada, Hawaii, and Mexico, but also devised a quota plan—joining up twenty percent of the colleges unaffiliated with ACPRA on September 1, 1951—with awards for achievement going both to districts and state chairman. Presidential plaques were awarded to the district subscribing the highest percentage of its quota and to the district showing the highest net gain over 1951. Certificates of

Achievement went to the chairmen making the best records and to all chairmen reaching or oversubscribing their quotas.[24]

District activities also reached a new peak in 1951-52, according to Marvin Osborn, Jr., vice president for districts. Attendance had climbed above the 700 mark—an average of more than fifty per district.[25]

The arrangement for financial support from the AAC for ACPRA's national office was scheduled to end in another year. At the Cleveland convention, the Association's Board of Directors authorized its National Office Committee, now headed by Arthur Brandon, to begin negotiations for a new contract. AAC's support was so important that the Association's budget for 1951-52 had been set at $19,042, with receipts of $19,172 anticipated. Receipts eventually exceeded expectations by nearly $1,000. In beginning negotiations with AAC it was hoped that a larger grant could be arranged, hopefully for a period of five years ending in August, 1958.[26]

A committee on convention policy, headed by William Nunn of the University of Minnesota, brought to the Board of Directors recommendations that henceforth convention sites be selected two years in advance, that convention dates fall within the period between June 16 and June 26, and that the Program Committee also be named two years in advance. In a meeting following the Cleveland convention the board voted unanimously to accept invitations to hold the 1953 convention in Salt Lake City and the 1954 meeting in New York City.[27]

Edward VonderHaar had made a study during the year to determine the thoroughness with which Boards of Directors had implemented past recommendations of the Plans and Policies Committee. His report showed that Association activities of the past six years had been in complete harmony with the committee's recommendations and that limited finances had been responsible in practically all instances where action had been deferred.[28]

Increasingly in the early 1950s, colleges and universities were adding to their staffs development officers charged with the important task of coordinating the fund-raising activities of their institutions. Individuals designated as "directors of development"—John Fields of the University of Southern California, and Robert J. Sailstad of Stephens College—had been listed in ACPRA's roster for the first time in 1949.[29] Now, thirteen persons whose titles included the word "development" were listed in the Association roster.[30] In only one case, that of the Reverend Charles J. Ryan, S.J., a vice president at Marquette University, were public relations and development combined in a title.

The Association's Plans and Policies Committee, headed by Eleanor Collier for the second year, now recommended establishment of services designed to meet the special needs of development officers "with a view to recognizing their activities as being essentially of a public relations nature and making membership in ACPRA attractive to them."

The committee also recommended (1) that district directors be used as an advisory board working under the chairmanship of the vice president for districts; (2) that increasing emphasis be placed on the Association's second objective as stated in the constitution: the advancement of higher education in general; (3) that a publications service be inaugurated to familiarize college and university administrators with the public relations aspects of common educational problems; (4) that the counseling service be developed to a greater degree; (5) that the Board of Directors explore possibilities for enlisting financial support from foundations, business, labor, etc., for special projects of the Association designed to serve the broad best interests of higher education; (6) that ACPRA efforts to improve cooperation with other educational associations be continued; (7) that definite objectives be determined for the T. T. Frankenberg Endowment Fund; and (8) that an annual clinic focusing analytical attention on a prominent current public relations problem in higher education be incorporated into ACPRA's administrative function."

Members were disturbed by "impossible criticisms being aimed at education in general and higher education in particular." So ACPRA's Board of Directors at its meeting in December had asked that the Resolutions

Committee bring to the 1952 convention a strongly-worded resolution meant to help counter these attacks. The delegates passed unanimously a resolution pointing out that the criticisms "had failed to distinguish between the proper and improper exercise of the freedom to teach" and deploring "these spurious and unwarranted attacks." It also reaffirmed "faith in freedom of inquiry and freedom of discussion as the very sources from which our Democracy can find the strength and unity so necessary for its survival in these perilous times."[31]

Two awards were conferred at the Cleveland convention, that for outstanding achievement by a member going to E. Ross Bartley, president in 1949-50, and that for distinguished service to education to Fred M. Hechinger, education editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*.[32] Early in 1952, President Johnston had also presented an award for distinguished service to education to the AAC at its annual meeting in Washington.[33]

For the second time in its history, ACPRA in 1952 designated a woman to become its president. Veta Lee Smith of Marshall College was named president-elect to succeed Edward P. VonderHaar after the completion of his term in 1953. Others elected to serve on the Board of Directors with VonderHaar were: vice presidents, Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., Mississippi State College, membership; James Jordan, University of Iowa, districts; and Tom Pastorious, Ohio Wesleyan University, athletics; secretary-treasurer, Francis Pray; editor of the *Quarterly*, Alice Beeman, University of Michigan, reelected; editor of the *News Letter*, John Busick, George Washington University; and directors-at-large, Douglass W. Miller, Case Institute of Technology, and the Reverend Arthur L. Dussault, S.J., Gonzaga University.[34] Joseph H. Mattox, Jr., Louisiana State University, was elected to membership on the Publications Advisory Board. Marc G. Waggener of the Indiana University Medical Center, under whose leadership the representatives of medical centers had become increasingly active in ACPRA since 1950, was named by VonderHaar as the first representative of the medical-public health group on the Association board. Busick left the college field shortly afterward and Bradford D. Ansley, Emory University, became *News Letter* editor.

W. Henry Johnston as ACPRA's first "athletic" president had felt more keenly than many others the import of the "fixes" and recruiting practices that had recently scandalized the nation. In his presidential address at the convention dinner, he pleaded for more direct and responsible action "to help restore the faith of the American public in the honesty and integrity of intercollegiate athletics."

"Today," he said, "there are shocking examples of wrong-doing on the part of athletes and trusted administrators; so shocking that the entire structure of intercollegiate athletics has been dealt an undeserved and staggering blow."

Control of athletics had been neglected by the presidents of most colleges and universities until recently, in Johnston's opinion. Now he was disturbed by the fact that many institutions had held spring practice in football despite action taken by the Presidents' Committee of the American Council on Education in February ruling out such practice.

"To me," declared Johnston, "it is a matter of principle, and the current effect is that many athletic departments look bigger than their presidents, and that is bad for all intercollegiate athletics, not just at those institutions. . . .

"What has happened [since February] creates lack of confidence and suspicion that leads me to implore the presidents to clarify a growing confusion which practically prevents any effective campaign to reestablish faith in the honor and integrity of college athletics. It behooves each of us to convince the public that our colleges are honorable and do not condone unethical practices. This will be a lengthy and constant process requiring patience and foresight. . . .

"We cannot blame outside interests for our difficulties," Johnston continued, "and the responsibility for straightening out the ills of intercollegiate athletics is strictly up to the presidents and faculties of our institutions, and to no one else.

"In closing, I wish to state that I am not trying to make enemies or criticize individuals. My whole theme is an appeal for cooperation, an appeal for tolerance divorced from apathy, and especially an appeal for courage and individual responsibility in restoring faith in the integrity of intercollegiate athletics. We often complain about the lack of space and time given by the press to education. Space and time are given to college athletics. We as public relations officers should do all we can to see that the press has a reason to present so much good about our activities that the few evils that are bound to exist are of insignificant nature.

"Our part (and I refer to all of us, even representatives of women's colleges) is to exert our influence for what we know is right in college operations, and to help all higher education by working to strengthen faith in its integrity. We are in a period when confidence and faith in almost everything is being tested. Next to the church, there is no more vital place that it be strengthened than in education. Let us do our part to see that the character of our colleges is not questioned. Conditions are better than they used to be, but we have many improvements yet to make."[35]

Action in a Time Of Hysteria

Although the term "public relations" had been used with increasing frequency since the early 1930s, and had become a part of the Association's name six years earlier, unanimity concerning the meaning and scope of the phrase was still lacking in 1952. A study made at Syracuse University and reported in the *Quarterly* pointed up this fact when it said: "Today in higher education as well as in industry and government, one can discern three main theories which attempt to establish the boundaries of public relations as a specialized activity. The first and most prevalent holds that public relations is a *technical* function, primarily concerned with influencing public opinion and attitudes through mass media. The second and more advanced theory insists that it is an *organizational* function embracing all the relations between an institution and its publics because all have an impact on public opinion. The third maintains that it is an *administrative* function, thus carrying the organizational approach to its logical conclusion: the impact different kinds of relations have on the public depends above all else on the formulation of sound policy."[36]

As ACPRA surveyed its opportunities and responsibilities at the beginning of its thirty-seventh year, there was good reason for it to believe that an amalgam of these three functions was necessary if public relations was to achieve much-needed results. Fortunately, the Associaton had as its president during 1952-53 a veteran of wide experience. Last of five bachelors who served as president of ACPRA during its first half century, Edward P. VonderHaar like many of the organization's leaders before him, had joined the staff of his alma mater soon after graduation and continued in its service throughout his professional career. A *magna cum laude* graduate of Ohio's Xavier University, VonderHaar had become executive secretary of the institution's alumni association in 1932. In following years he had served in such posts of public relations significance as director of publicity, business manager of athletics, and secretary to the President's Council. In 1942 he became Xavier's first director of public relations. Meanwhile, he had risen to leadership in ACPRA, which he served as secretary-treasurer from 1948 until he became president-elect in 1951. In the years following 1952 he would not only become Xavier's vice president for public relations and development, but also the first person to serve as president of both ACPRA and the even larger professional organization, Public Relations Society of America.

The problems of higher education had never appeared larger than they did when VonderHaar assumed the presidency. In an address delivered before the Association's District I and later published in *College Public Relations Quarterly*, Francis H. Horn, executive secretary of the Association for Higher Education, said: "In our day the responsibilities laid upon higher institutions are staggering. The fate of free men everywhere, of the civilization they have so long struggled to achieve, hangs in the balance, and it is the nature of the educational process, especially of higher education, which may tip the scales one way or the other. But if the responsibilities are tremendous, so are the opportunities. The challenge to the colleges and universities has never been greater."

Standing out at this time as the three major problems of higher education in Horn's opinion, were: (1) the need to clarify objectives; (2) the need to find ways of increasing financial support; and (3) the need to meet the mounting attacks on academic freedom. Scandals involving college athletics, public officials, and the general citizenry had recently shocked the nation. People had seemed ready to blame the colleges, sometimes for lack of definite objectives, other times for failure to emphasize objectives giving particular attention to moral and spiritual values.

"Until institutions of higher education more clearly define their objectives and work more positively and directly to reach them," Horn had said, "it is unlikely that they will carry out most effectively the heavy responsibilities laid upon them."

This was a day, also, of growing hysteria among a citizenry deathly afraid of infiltration by the Communist party. Again it was the colleges and universities which bore the brunt of blame. Magazines like the *American Mercury*, the *Freeman*, and the *American Legion Monthly*, newspapers like the Chicago *Tribune*, columnists like Westbrook Pegler, and authors like Louis Bromfield had mounted a concerted attack on academic freedom and so-called "Red professors."

Investigations by congressional and legislative committees had followed, and as a result "subversive textbooks" were sometimes burned, gag rules and loyalty oaths sometimes imposed. "Unless the intimidation of professors is halted—there is considerable evidence that professors are increasingly afraid to speak out on controversial issues—the greatness of our institutions of higher learning is doomed," Horn felt impelled to comment. "Instead of moving forward to achieve the tremendous opportunities open to them, colleges and universities will be but shadows of what they have been in the past as a result of their courageous and devoted search for truth and the advancement of knowledge."

Horn was not the only educator who saw large problems growing out of the witch hunts then so popular. Four other articles appearing in *College Public Relations Quarterly* in the spring and summer of 1953 also touched on these problems. So, too, did all of the major addresses delivered at the Association's 1953 convention. Programs for most district meetings also included addresses and discussions related to the situation.

Horn and others saw the job of the public relations officer as "one of staggering proportions as colleges and universities moved to meet their current problems."

"The task of public relations is a tough one," Horn emphasized. "It requires top-notch personnel to carry out the important and exacting responsibilities. The public relations director must be a good publicity and promotion man. But he must be more. If he is to be an effective interpreter of his college and higher education both within the institution and to the public outside, he must be thoroughly informed about both. He must know what is going on everywhere in the institution; he must be familiar with and understand its many problems, those of objectives, policies, curriculum, extracurricular activities, and finance; he must know personally as many as possible of the administration, faculty, and student body and be able to establish friendly relations with them. He must, to exaggerate, see all, hear all, know all—but he must comprehend it all and have the ability to use it in this task of building understanding and support for the institution. In addition, his knowledge must extend to higher education itself—to its current status, its present and future trends, and its multifarious problems. He will have to get around—particularly he will need to talk to and meet with others than his professional public relations colleagues, important though that is. He must be as ubiquitous and as volatile as the president, whose good right arm in truth he should be. . . .

"This type of public relations director is still somewhat rare, but he is desperately needed in these troublesome days for higher education. The colleges will find more such directors if they set their sights for persons with these superior qualifications for the job, and if the ACPRA and its members recognize the expanded concept of the role of college public relations. As this concept is heightened, individuals will rise to meet it; many public relations people who have not yet attained this greater stature will develop it under the challenge to their abilities that the present situation affords. Their responsibility, and yes, that even of those public relations people who must work rather imperfectly at their tasks, is a heavy one; they have an important contribution to make to the future of American higher education and thus to the very preservation of our free society and our cherished civilization."[37]

The problem of finance was scarcely less important for the nation's colleges and universities at this time than that of meeting the attacks on their traditional freedom. As a result, public relations directors, especially as the concept of their job grew, were playing an ever-increasing role in fund-raising efforts. The cost of all higher education in America in the academic year 1950 had been more than two billion dollars, according to the Federal Office of Education. Now higher education, according to a study made by the Commission on Financing Higher Education, needed almost double that figure and even this sum would be inadequate for the demands of the years ahead.[38] Five common pressures, the commission had reported, were responsible for the financial difficulties of colleges and universities at this time: "(1) Inflation, which in a little over one decade has reduced the purchasing powers of the educational dollar by almost one half. (2) The expansion of educational services demanded by the increasing complexity of our knowledge, by the need for more research, by improvement in instructional methods, and by expanded student personnel and advisory services. (3) Fluctuating student enrollments which were reduced by the second World War, greatly enlarged by the flood of veterans, reduced as this flood receded, and then again threatened by the manpower requirements of the armed forces. (4) Needs for enlarged and modernized capital plants to keep pace with enrollment, new needs, and expanded services. (5) Uncertain sources of income from gifts, endowment, and government with which to meet all these complicated situations."[39]

The term "development" as a synonym for fund raising had made its appearance in the late 1940s and yearly thereafter more and more institutions established development offices. In some institutions the development and public relations offices were coordinated; in most, however, they were not coordinated initially. In fact, a survey of seventy-two institutions made in 1953 revealed fourteen different patterns of organization for development programs.[40]

As the important relationship between public relations and fund raising became more evident many colleges saw the need for coordinating their efforts to achieve maximum benefits. In more and more colleges, as a result, departments of public relations and development were created with responsibility for all public relations activities, including fund raising, publicity, editing of publications, recruitment of students, arrangements for special events, and other activities meant to increase understanding and support.

With the realization that good public relations were essential for maximum success in fund raising and that, indeed, fund raising in itself was a form of public relations, ACPRA during 1952-53 increased its attention to the problems of development. Both the *News Letter* and *College Public Relations Quarterly* devoted considerable space to development problems and efforts. Fund raising and development also received major attention on the Association's 1953 convention program, principally through six seminars for which nearly thirty persons served as panelists or recorders.

Eleven of the sixty pages in which the *Quarterly* for October, 1953, covered the addresses and seminars of the convention were devoted to the seminars in which fund raising of every type was given comprehensive attention under the leadership of John E. Fields of the University of Southern California.

The subject was also discussed less extensively in seminars held for state universities and land-grant colleges, Catholic schools, and other church-related colleges.[41] By this time ACPRA's membership included twenty-one individuals with the word "development" in their titles. At the convention, there was initial discussion of forming a division of the Association geared especially to the interests of development officers.

Interest in television as a medium of public relations continued to grow. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) had on April 14, 1952, lifted its freeze on television imposed in September, 1948, and adopted a table of assignments making possible the establishment of 2,053 stations. Of this total 242 positions were being reserved for education. First institution to file with the FCC for a permit to construct a noncommercial educational station, according to the *ACPRA News Letter*, was Kansas State College on June 28. The University of Kansas followed suit a week later.[42]

Although only twenty-two applications for noncommercial stations were received during the first nine months following the FCC's action, colleges and college people, public relations officers especially, devoted considerable time to this developing medium of communication. In the larger cities such as New York and Washington, colleges cooperated on television programs of an educational nature. In other cities individual colleges and universities provided for commercial station programs on a wide variety of subjects, much as they had been doing for radio. In dozens of areas over the nation universities sponsored or co-sponsored workshops to acquaint college people with the opportunities and problems of telecasting. And in most instances ACPRA members were involved.

Most of the district meetings also provided for discussion of television along with radio. Meanwhile, *College Public Relations Quarterly* carried extensive articles on television advances and programming in its spring and summer issues with emphasis on public relations benefits. Then, at ACPRA's 1953 convention, three seminars on television and radio were held under the direction of Lynn Poole, with ten persons discussing "Why Go on the Air?" "Who Goes on the Air?" and "What Goes on the Air?"

Closed-circuit television was also gaining popularity as this time, but with some uneasiness on the part of teachers. Editor Bradford Ansley, while devoting considerable space in the *News Letter* to news of closed-circuit television, felt impelled to editorialize:

"We wish to say that the idea of television 'replacing' the teacher is hogwash and that the public relations folk in education would do well to use their influence to dissuade trustees and boards of control from using this pitch as a selling point with legislatures, donors, etc. The fact is that educational television . . . will have its chief value in the ill-defined but important field of enrichment. To promote it as a panacea for the teacher shortage or a means of further robotizing already over-mechanized secondary school teaching methods is to invite the opposition of teacher groups and to focus the hopes of the public no less than the efforts of the educators on the wrong goal."[43]

Rounding out the organization ACPRA needed to function effectively on all fronts, President VonderHaar had completed the list of appointive officers in the fall of 1952. The appointments included William E. Keys, University of Texas, director for media activities; Lyle M. Nelson, University of Oregon, director for research; Marc G. Waggener, Indiana University Medical Center, medical-public health representative, reappointed; George H. Holmes, Iowa State Teachers College, associate editor of the *Quarterly* for 1953-54 with responsibility for the October, 1953, issue devoted to the 1953 convention; and Horace W. Hewlett, Amherst College, advertising manager of publications.[44]

ACPRA's *News Letter* for November 1 reported on a survey which indicated that increased value was being placed on public relations services in higher education. The median salary of public relations directors in colleges and universities responding to this survey, conducted by the College and

University Personnel Association, was found to be higher than that for any other management officer, presidents, business managers, and hospital superintendents excepted. Salaries for public relations officers, according to the survey, ranged from $3,300 to $15,000, with the median at $6,700 and the mean at $7,025.

Newcomers were receiving increased attention in ACPRA each year, a fact which helped to boost the membership to record highs in 1952 and again in 1953. A major service for those new to the college public relations field was reported in the *News Letter* for April 15. Under the guidance of Alvie L. Smith, news bureau editor at Michigan State College, the Association was inaugurating a "packet service" through which members could borrow oustanding examples of materials being used in various facets of public relations activity. Already available were packets on student recruitment, fund raising, annual reports, and sports promotion. Packets would be available soon on viewbooks, faculty-staff handbooks, publications for special events, and miscellaneous materials.

With former President Edward Whittlesey as general chairman, ACPRA also held two seminars for newcomers at its 1953 convention, one on "What Can ACPRA Do for You?" and the other on "Management of an Education Public Relations Program."[45]

With the approval of ACPRA's Board of Directors, sports publicity men continued in 1953 the practice of holding a meeting during the winter at the same time the National Collegiate Athletic Association held its convention. At the 1953 meeting on January 6-7 in Washington, the thirty-seven sports publicists in attendance organized the Sports Section of the American College Public Relations Association, much along the lines the medical school-public health people had organized a year earlier. James Coogan of Pennsylvania State College was named as the division's president and James King of Marquette University was elected secretary-treasurer. It was anticipated that the Sports Section president would automatically become ACPRA's vice president for athletic activities.[46]

Meanwhile, the Medical-Public Health Section, organized informally in 1950 and formally in 1952 under the leadership of Marc Waggener, had grown in size and activity. More than thirty persons whose primary interests were in some phase of medical or public health activity were now members. Cooperative efforts had begun with the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the formulation of methods for exchanging ideas and materials was planned. Unlike the Sports Section, which was placing its emphasis increasingly on a mid-winter meeting along with the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Medical Section continued to place its emphasis on the closest possible tie with ACPRA, including seminars at the time of the Association's annual meeting. Four such seminars, with twenty individuals, were held at the 1953 convention.[47]

ACPRA by this time was spreading knowledge and appreciation of public relations activities through cooperative efforts with or services for nearly a dozen organizations. A study of salaries had been completed with the Public Relations Society of America and committees or projects had been continued or started with the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of Collegiate Registrars, the Association of Higher Education of NEA, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Alumni Council, the Industrial Editors Association, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and several church-related groups, notably the Methodists.[48]

Twice in 1952-53 members of ACPRA were saddened by the death of a past president. Louis C. Boochever, president from 1931 to 1933, and more recently director of public relations for the American Red Cross, died in Washington on November 30, 1952, at the age of sixty-two. Robert X. Graham, president in 1938-39 and the individual most responsible for the Association's Credo, died in New York City on February 3, 1953, at the age of fifty.[49]

"Mobilizing Support for Higher Education," the theme for ACPRA's 1953 convention held in Salt Lake City on June 28-July 1, was inspired by the work of the Commission on Financing Higher Education whose report was quoted earlier in this chapter. Planned by Parry D. Sorensen of the University of Utah and Donald K. Anderson of the University of Washington, the convention program again followed the Michigan plan of giving maximum time to seminars covering all facets of public relations.

Only two addresses, one called "The Challenge to Higher Education," by A. Crawford Greene of the Commission on Financing Higher Education, the other called "Virile Leadership—the Need of Education," by President A. Ray Olpin of the University of Utah, were given at the convention in addition to the presidential address by VonderHaar. More than 125 persons participated in thirty-six seminars covering twelve fields of interest.

For many of the delegates, it was their first trip to Salt Lake. Never to be forgotten were their opportunities to hear the great Mormon Choir singing from the tabernacle and to bob about on the waters of Great Salt Lake. So, too, were the afternoon and evening devoted to a scenic trip to Cottonwood Canyon where all were guests of *Life* and ate a buffet supper.

Although he saw the increasing enrollments projected for the years immediately ahead, the threat against academic freedom, and the financial pinch as challenges to higher education, Greene in his address concluded on "a broader and deeper note . . . to you who speak for higher education."

"Now, when the great issue in the world is the struggle between free nations and tyranny, when America and civilization itself are in jeopardy," he said, "higher education has not only the opportunity but the duty to lead—to lead our people to a full understanding of what freedom has meant and now means to our nation, of the part it has played in religion, in education, in our national economy, in business, in the exercise of our civil rights, in our homes and friendships. It is peculiarly its province to teach freedom not only in its classrooms, but by a united program to bring the same message to farm and factory, to office and home; to warn of the dangers not from outside hostilities alone, but from the hidden hazards of regimentation, bureauracy, and extravagance within; to persuade our people and those to whom we delegate authority to test their every action by its effort on freedom, and to determine policy on the basis of such tests; to bring to those who serve the country on the field of battle and at home in the day-to-day tasks of life, understanding and conviction that the stake of freedom is worth the price, no matter what the cost."

In his address emphasizing virile leadership as the need of education, President Olpin expressed belief that the only way to counteract criticism of the day "is for educators and administrators of educational programs to come up with a virile program of leadership and an improved program of public relations."

"It is our responsibility as a public relations front representing higher education," he asserted, "to keep constantly before the public the objectives, the contributions, the ideals, the products, and the value of our institutions."[50]

Before, during, and after the convention the Association's Board of Directors spent nearly thirteen hours in five sessions. Of great satisfaction was the report of Marvin Osborn, vice president for membership, which revealed that ACPRA had 922 members, forty-four more than the previous high of 873 the preceding year.[51] This figure was later corrected to 917.

The report of Secretary-Treasurer Francis Pray indicated that the net worth of the Association had increased nearly 300 percent between 1950 and 1952, from $5,544 to $20,807. His report also showed that the T. T. Frankenberg Endowment Fund had now reached $1,030 through the efforts of a committee headed for the last three years by Wendell Kellogg of Hofstra College. At its fourth session the board voted to establish a reserve savings account of $10,000 transferred from the general fund.[52]

Like Harold Schellenger in 1946-47, VonderHaar clocked more that 25,000 miles as he traveled the country on ACPRA business during his presidency. Most of the miles were accumulated in attending district meetings from coast to coast, and ACPRA files reveal that a large share of the traveling was done at his own expense.[53]

James Jordan, vice president for district activities, reported that academic freedom, current investigations, fund raising, foundation activity, and other matters of broad interest held prominent places on district meeting programs along with methods, techniques, and general "how-to-do-it" sessions. As a result of a poll taken among members of District XV and a recommendation presented by Jordan, that district was dissolved and the ten institutions composing it were assigned to X, XI, and XII, depending upon their location.[54]

The report of Executive Secretary Marvin Topping brought good news. The Association of American Colleges, whose aid had enabled ACPRA to establish its national office in the fall of 1950, would continue to furnish office space for the Association in 1953-54 and in addition would contribute $1,000 toward its expenses. Believing that additional avenues for mutual service existed, the two organizations named a joint committee to explore all possibilities.[55]

Lyle Nelson, director of research, reported plans for a major survey to determine why students selected the college they attended. A preliminary sampling taken among high school students gave Nelson an inkling of what the major factors would be: financial considerations, such as scholarship opportunities and jobs available, and nearness to home. Most students were choosing their college before completing the first semester of their senior year in high school and many even before starting their senior year.[56]

Upon the recommendation of Horace Hewlett, advertising manager for publications, this office was abolished and its duties transferred to the executive secretary.[57]

Louis H. Bell of Pennsylvania State College several months back had been named chairman of a committee to consider possibilities for special groups within ACPRA. The directors now accepted a committee recommendation that groups dealing with a *special phase* of public relations, such as sports, medicine, and fund raising, be encouraged to organize within the framework of ACPRA. On the other hand, the committee recommended, and the directors concurred, that groups seeking to organize separately because of the *character* of the institutions they represented (teachers colleges, sectarian colleges, land-grant colleges, etc.) should be denied this privilege lest such action lead to disunity and ineffectiveness.[58]

Upon the recommendation of the Committee on Plans and Policies, still headed by Eleanor Collier, the board decided on action meant to counteract the derogatory publicity which higher education had received as a result of recent congressional inquiries. To implement the recommendation, the board urged each member "to reexamine his program of public information and renew his efforts to present clearly and understandably the policies and practices of his institution, simultaneously wherever possible, combining this story with that of sister institutions in a well-considered effort to give the public the true picture of today's college and university aims and achievements." It also established a Committee on Interpretation of Academic Responsibility to take charge of all Association developments in this regard.[59]

Before adjourning their final business meeting, the delegates selected Chicago as the site for the 1955 convention. Charles A. Brecht, of St. John's University, Brooklyn, chosen the year before to be convention director for 1954, announced that the theme for the meeting to be held in New York City on June 21-24 would be "Advancing Man's Right to Knowledge." Thus it would tie in with the theme for Columbia University's bicentennial to be celebrated throughout 1954.

ACPRA's 1953 awards for distinguished service to education went to the Fund for Adult Education and to Frank W. Abrams, chairman of the board of Standard Oil of New Jersey. One of two awards for outstanding achievement went to Lyle Nelson "whose effective leadership and personal contribution to the interpretation of higher education, its underlying principles and precepts, have brought new understanding and appreciation to the art of higher teaching, . . ." The other went to Marc Waggener, "who, through his vision and insight, through purpose tempered with patience, and through organizational skill and exceptional ability has brought diverse and special interests together for collective consideration of their mutual concepts for the immediate benefit of American medical education and the utlimate good of all educational interpretation." Boyd M. McKeown, soon to retire from his public relations post with the Methodist Church, and Fred Hechinger, education editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, were made honorary members of the Association.[60]

Veta Lee Smith, secretary of the college at Marshall College, who had become president-elect at the 1952 convention, was installed as president for 1953-54, and Francis C. Pray, public relations counselor at the University of Pittsburgh, was named president-elect.

Vice presidents introduced were Fred Hess, Nebraska Wesleyan University, membership; John E. Fields, University of Southern California, districts; and James Coogan, Pennsylvania State College, athletics. Other officers elected were: secretary-treasurer, Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., Mississippi State College; editor of the *Quarterly*, William G. Wilcox, Ohio State University; and editor of the *News Letter*, Horace Hewlett, Amherst College. Alice L. Beeman, University of Michigan, was elected to continue on the Publications Advisory Board.[61]

Speaking on "The Third Dimension in Public Relations," VonderHaar in his presidential address told his colleagues that they must understand man "as he ought to be" if they expected to understand and interpret "the noble purposes to which your colleges and universities are dedicated."

"You must," VonderHaar said, "understand where man came from, why he is here, and where he is going because these are the things that determine the fitness of all actions and activities. For these answers you turn to the philosophers, the theologians, the educators, the statesmen, for they deal in the values that make man different from the creation about him.

"We have spent these three days studying the blueprint of college public relations," VonderHaar concluded. "We have been looking at the length and breadth of our jobs. Tonight I ask that you stand back and get a perspective. Move away from the surface of things. Move to a depth where you see reference points between yourself and your jobs. Let these reference points be your understanding of man—of man as he is, of man as he was, and of man as he ought to be. Then you will get perspective, then you will see your work—the third dimension."[62]

Leaders Foresee Expanded Program

Veta Lee Smith became, on September 1, 1953, the second and last of the women to serve in the presidency of ACPRA before its merger with the American Alumni Council in 1974. She was a person of gentle disposition but clear purpose and firm resolution. She took office at a time when the Association was coming of age, when far-seeing plans were being originated under one president, maturing under the next, then being implemented fully under a third or even a fourth. Under Mrs. Smith's leadership ACPRA enjoyed in 1953-54 a year of solid advance in every area of its activity.

The new president had an excellent background for the presidency—six years as a high school teacher and fourteen years as secretary of Marshall College, a post which called for her to be the institution's public relations officer. She had also served on ACPRA's Board of Directors since 1948, including three years as a vice president and one as director-at-large before being named president-elect in 1952. She had also served, and was still serving, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Public Relations for ACPRA and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Early in her administration, Mrs. Smith addressed an open letter to Association members, inviting their assistance and participation in a project which promised to have long-range effects on the organization and its activities.

"There are times in the history of any association," she wrote, "when it should be examined closely to see if it is performing the functions for which it was created, to see if its organization has kept step with the times, to see if it is providing for its members, and for the society of which it is a part, those worthwhile purposes for which it should exist.

"As your Board of Directors met in Salt Lake City last June, they faced many recurrent problems for which there were no easy answers—problems involving purpose, objectives, membership categories. They began to realize that certain basic policy questions would have to be answered, soberly and thoughtfully, before ready answers would be forthcoming to some of the more pressing, immediate problems."[63]

After considerable disussion the directors had agreed that the Association should "undertake a thorough survey of its objectives, its constitution and bylaws, its organization, and its present system and practices of government." A committee composed of retiring President VonderHaar, Mrs. Smith, and Executive Secretary Topping was authorized to "lay the groundwork and determine personnel and procedure for launching such a study." Francis Pray, who had become president-elect for 1953-54, was then named chairman of the committee to initiate the survey. The committee was being formed at the same time Mrs. Smith wrote her open letter. Her objective was not merely to acquaint members with the existence of the study committee but more important to urge every member to send constructive suggestions to Pray.

By the time the Board of Directors held its midyear meeting in Cincinnati in January, 1954, Pray's committee had determined to concentrate on two activities: a study of the professional development of public relations for higher education; and a study leading to an internal reorganization of the Association, including the drafting of new bylaws to replace the present constitution and bylaws.

Pray proposed to implement the first project, "A Study of Educational Public Relations—Opportunities, Responsibilities, Objectives," through a five-day conference which would "take stock (1) of the public relations director to see whether or not he is on the right track as public relations develops as a function in the administration of higher education; (2) of the American College Public Relations Association to see whether or not is is on the right track as it seeks to develop programs to serve higher education as a whole; and (3) of the public relations of higher education itself to see whether the problems of higher education are defined with sufficient clarity and objectiveness so that they can be attacked with some hope of ultimate success."

The conference proposed by Pray's committee would cost an estimated $17,000, with financing to be sought from an appropriate foundation. Pray's presentation to the Board of Directors was in fact the same proposal prepared for presentation to a foundation if the plan received the directors' approval. In conclusion, the committee's proposal stated:

"We think this is perhaps the first time a professional association in higher education has sought the guidance of others in determining its objectives. We think there are specific merits in this proposal. We think the function of public relations must be defined by those responsible for the direction of higher education, assisted by those with special professional experience in the problems of educational administration. We are convinced that the study we are seeking will help establish four things:

"(1) It will define and give direction to this new staff position in higher education administration. It will assist college and university presidents in organizing for and utilizing this new staff assistance. It will assist them in evaluating the work of their public relations officer and will provide them with criteria for selection and definition of duties.

"(2) It will assist the public relations officer in the field of higher education to understand what responsibilities should be expected of him from the standpoint of the top educational administrator. It will begin a sound definition of a pattern for professional growth.

"(3) It will provide guideposts for the further development of the organization of the American College Public Relations Association for greater educational and professional usefulness.

"(4) And finally, the study will tend to crystallize effective public relations answers to the problems of interpretation which face higher education. It will provide an outline for further development, and encouragement for other professional thinking, and conceivably, a pattern through which our multitudinous and diffuse public relations efforts can be brought to bear with sufficient impact on the public to win for higher education the larger degree of understanding and support which it needs."[64]

The board endorsed the proposal and empowered the committee both to seek funds to support it and to make such changes in the proposal as it deemed necessary. Pray reported at the annual meeting of the directors in June, 1954, that his first request to a foundation for support of the special study had been turned down but that other foundations would be contacted.[65]

The groundwork had been laid for the distinguished Greenbrier Conference, which was held four years later with the cooperation of the American Alumni Council and a grant from the Ford Foundation.

The second study proposed by Pray's Committee—that concerning internal reorganization—was completed during the year by a subcommittee headed by James R. Jordan of the University of Iowa. As a result of the findings, the constitution and bylaws were almost completely rewritten into a set of bylaws considerably more comprehensive and specific.

Under the new bylaws, ACPRA was defined for the first time as a nonprofit organization. Categories of membership under the former constitution—institutional, educational agency, personal, and honorary—were reduced to three: institutional, educational agency, and individual, with only the institutional member having voting privileges. Individual memberships, however, were divided into six categories: active, associate, personal, student, business, and honorary life. The student category was created to attract and accommodate a large number of the young people who were beginning to prepare for public relations as a life-long vocation.

The most radical changes represented by the new bylaws, however, lay in the extensive sections devoted to administration and governance. The number of elective offices was reduced from eight to six. For the three vice presidents there was a new alignment of duties, one officer being responsible for both districts and membership, a second for publications and Association services, and the third for sections (areas such as athletics, development, medical-public health—and, in all probability, still others before long). To be eligible for election to an ACPRA office an individual must have had five years of active membership in the Association, rather than two as in the past. Three years of prior service on the Board of Directors, at least one as an elected officer, were still a requisite for election to the office of president-elect. Editors of Association publications would henceforth be appointed by the president, instead of being elected by the membership. Other appointive offices would be the executive secretary, director for research, and director for the annual meeting.[66]

The composition of the Board of Directors was almost completely changed by the bylaws. In addition to the elected officers and the immediate past president, the board would include representatives elected by and from each district within the Association (in the ratio of one director for each fifty institutional members represented in the district), and representatives elected by and from each section within the Association on the same one to fifty ratio basis. At least two years of active membership would be a requisite for election to the board as the representative of a district or section. Appointed officers, the executive secretary excepted, would be *ex officio* members of the board.

The Board of Directors, meeting once a year in connection with the annual convention, would determine general policies of the Association, determine and delineate areas to be organized as districts, approve and charter sections, determine policies of publications and act as publisher, sit as a court of inquiry in cases involving charges against members for violation of ethical standards, dismiss members from the Association for due cause, and receive reports of officers and committees.

The new bylaws also created an Executive Committee composed of the elected officers—president, president-elect, secretary-treasurer, and three vice presidents—together with the immediate past president. The executive secretary would have a voice but no vote in the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was authorized to meet at least twice a year to direct the Association's administrative work.

The new bylaws also called for three standing committees—Publications, Awards, and Nominating—to be appointed by the president; changed the fiscal year from September 1-August 31 to July 15-July 14; set dues for institutional, educational agency, and personal memberships at $25, those for individual active and associate members at $7.50, those for student members at $5, and those for business members at $50.

The matter of sections, covered by two sentences in the old constitution, received extensive coverage in an article of six sections in the new bylaws. The first bylaw read: "To promote the interests of functional groups in educational public relations, sections may be established within the membership, effect organization, hold meetings, elect officers, adopt bylaws, levy dues, and perform appropriate functions of their interest. The chief officer of a section shall be designated by a title other than president. . . ." A two-thirds majority vote of the Association's Board of Directors would be needed to approve formation of a section and by a two-thirds vote the board could also discontinue a section.[67]

Individual memberships in ACPRA soared over the 1,000 mark for the first time in 1953-54, thanks to the aggressive leadership of Fred Hess, vice president for membership. Hess enlisted forty-seven state membership chairmen, secured the active assistance of the district directors and selected district aides, and continued to give recognition to districts and individuals outstanding in their campaign efforts. By April 1 Hess was able to report that the campaign was only two short of its goal, and by June 1 the roster included 1,038 members. The thousandth membership, by chance, had gone with appropriate ceremony to Wilson Compton, president of the Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE).[68] The final report for the year showed the membership at 1,051.[69]

ACPRA's net worth, according to the report of Secretary-Treasurer Osborn at convention time in 1954, had increased to more than $21,000. The Budget Committee, headed by past President VonderHaar, had set the budget for 1953-54 at $24,775. However, receipts for the first ten months of the fiscal year had been $22,429 and expenses only $17,705.

"Our current philosophy of budgeting, now that we have a substantial reserve [the $10,000 reserve fund established the previous fall]," Osborn reported, "is to give each member the maximum service that his dollars will buy rather than saving for the benefit of future members."[70]

Publications, along with the district and section programs, continued to provide the largest services for members. However, the Packet Loan Service inaugurated the preceding year and the Placement Service, a permanent feature since the advent of the national office in 1950, had both grown sizably. In seven areas of public relations activity—student recruitment, fund raising, viewbooks, annual reports, faculty and staff, sports, and miscellaneous publications—335 packets had been sent out to fifty-seven new member schools during the year as compared to 150 to thirty-two schools the year before. With two months to go, the Placement Service had filled fifteen positions, compared to eighteen for the preceding fiscal year. The number of applicants registered had reached 139 and 119 of these had been processed.[71]

The fifth anniversary of *College Public Relations Quarterly* was observed in 1953-54. Editor William Wilcox was able to achieve greater diversity by securing twenty authors from outside the membership. In the first issue he edited, Wilcox included an article titled "College Age Population Trends" written by Ronald B. Thompson, registrar at Ohio State University. It warned ACPRA members of new dimensions in public relations which would surely come into play increasingly in the next fifteen years. The number of births in the nation had increased to approximately eleven times the number of deaths in recent years, and Thompson supplied convincing statistics to indicate that college enrollments might grow nearly 100 percent by 1970. Growth of this nature, because of the strain placed on facilities, faculty, and finances, would call for public relations of the highest quality.[72]

The wave of "anti-intellectualism" rolling over the country continued to put a strain on the fund-raising efforts of colleges and universities. This problem was complicated in many instances by the inclination of some college teachers to "hide behind the Fifth Amendment." The attitude of most Americans was expressed by Charles H. Brower, a trustee of Rutgers University, in an address before ACPRA's District II which was later published in the *Quarterly*:

"I feel that a professor or an instructor who fails to reply to questions because of the Fifth Amendment must either have guilty associations with Communism or he does not have such associations. If his record is clean and he refuses to talk, he damages the standing of his school, and threatens all academic freedom unnecessarily. In that case he should, in my opinion, be removed from the faculty by his own fellow members. If he has guilty associations he should, of course, be removed. So you may quote me, as an individual, as being in favor of removing from the faculty any member who takes refuge in the Fifth Amendment."[73]

Current misunderstandings and criticisms of colleges and universities were in part the fault of the institutions themselves, James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said in the article, "An Educational Administrator Looks at Public Relations."

"As the functions, size, and responsibilities of these institutions have grown in response to the increasing complexity of our society," said Killian, "we have somehow failed to keep in clear view of the American people some of the special characteristics and problems of educational institutions. From time to time the universities have lost sight of their true nature and their primary aim and have set up sideshows in which the high principles of the university have not been observed. These sideshows have tended to obscure the overwhelming integrity of the university system as a whole. Most noticeable of all these failures of the universities, however, has probably been our failure to keep adequately in contact with our constituents. . . through well considered public relations. . . .

"Fundamental to our public relations problems in industry, education, and all other fields is the importance of achieving a climate of good will in the United States. We can each of us help in doing this by demonstrating good will ourselves. We can help by embracing every opportunity to highlight the need for confidence in each other and our dependence upon each other. We need to highlight the soundness, the goodness, and loyalty of our fellow Americans and to bring into the full light of day the deep vein of altruism which runs through our society. We need to stress how much, rather than how little, we have reason for pride and confidence in our neighbors and our institutions. For our national morale and unity we need to 'accentuate the positive' more and to dwell less on the defects and weaknesses of a few—a very few of our fellows and our enterprises. We must insist that building America up cannot be achieved by tearing Americans down. This point of view, I venture to suggest, is fundamental to sound achievement in the field of public relations."[74]

Fred Hechinger, education editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, suggested in an article titled "Interpreting Education to the Public" that nothing could be more helpful in telling the story of education than to permit enlightened academic controversy to take the stage in full view of the people.

"The most effective way of taking the wind out of the critics' sails," he declared, "is by inviting the public to listen to, and join with, the educators in the continuing debate on how to educate, how to teach, and how to learn.

"If this can be done, a by-product of the process may perhaps offer the nation that most vital of cornerstones of education: the knowledge that controversy is something to be proud of—something to be honestly and openly engaged in; that controversy is the only road to worthwhile and lasting agreement; and that true understanding should not be based on the fallacy that everyone is and thinks alike but on the truth that people differ widely and that their thinking and their ideas are far apart."[75]

Clarence A. Schoenfeld, chairman of the Department of Journalism at the University of Wisconsin, emphasized that much of the success of any college's public relations program depends upon the quality of the institution's teaching. In an article, "Teaching IS Public Relations," he wrote:

"Unfortunately, some presidents and professors continue to overlook the fact that it is performance, and not publicity, which will determine the long-run well-being of higher education. They expect some mysterious magic of advertising to produce the funds and freshmen necessary to academic solvency. It is up to us to hammer home a sounder point of view.

"Basic to acceptable academic performance is superior teaching. A university's public relations program begins in the classroom. The professor himself is the university's key public relations man. Nothing is so calculated to separate, in countless bold and subtle ways, the university from its most precious publics—the undergraduate, his parents, and his friends—as poor teaching. Nothing, on the other hand, is more effective in the recruitment of promising students and the fostering of loyal alumni than excellent undergraduate instruction."[76]

The ACPRA *News Letter* in 1953-54, as in the past, devoted most of its pages to brief items about individuals, districts, and committees, but two subjects—fund raising and educational television—received frequent and sometimes special treatment. Of particular interest was the news that on October 16 the U. S. Supreme Court had upheld the right of corporations to make gifts to privately-supported educational institutions. Stockholders in the A.P. Smith Manufacturing Company had filed suit against the company for giving $1,500 to Princeton University. The stockholders lost their case, appealed it to the Supreme Court of New Jersey, lost again, and appealed it to the U.S. Supreme Court. The federal court then held that a corporation, like an individual, had the right to improve its business by any legitimate means, including the generation of good will by charitable gifts.

The opinion of the Supreme Court of New Jersey had said, "There is now widespread belief . . . that free and vigorous nongovernmental institutions of learning are vital to our democracy and the system of free enterprise and that withdrawal of corporate authority to make such contributions within reasonable limits would seriously threaten their continuance. . . . Clearly then, the appellants, as individual stockholders whose private interests rest entirely upon the well-being of the plaintiff corporation, ought not be permitted to close their eyes to present-day realities and thwart the long-visioned corporate action in recognizing and voluntarily discharging its high obligations as a constituent of our modern social structure."[77]

The rapid growth of development as a facet of college administrative activity had by this time led to some argument over the relationship of public relations to development, and the relative importance of each of the two functions. After many heated discussions, the final word, at least for 1953-54, came from James W. Armsey, formerly of Illinois Institute of Technology and now assistant to the chancellor at New York University.

"The financial plight of higher education has brought the fund raiser, development man, or whatever he is called to the forefront," Armsey wrote for the *News Letter*. "But to confuse his job with basic public relations is to put the emphasis in the wrong place and downgrade a fundamental philosophy and function which must, to be really effective, permeate the whole university or college structure.

"Public relations seeks to relate a university's philosophy and program with the public welfare; to establish sound principles, applied with honesty, discretion, and forthrightness; to interpret policies and programs in the light of community needs and problems. It is constant, long-range, often specific, and justified by faith in its fundamental principles.

"Development is the hard, painful, demanding job of getting money. It is often, of necessity, short-range (although it must be continuing as well). It is specific, pinpointed, most often immediate. Its results are more easily measured than those of public relations.

"Public relations and development are not the same, nor should one be subordinated to the other. Public relations establishes the climate in which development can be successful. Development provides the funds, over and above tuition receipts, or research money, or tax allotments, by which an institution may do its job better or more abundantly.

"Public relations and development are both important. They are not incompatible. They help one another. Both require personal and professional integrity, clear thinking, and hard work. Let's give each its due and get on with the job of making higher education better understood, more sympathetically appreciated, and more widely supported."[78]

Developments in educational television came rapidly in 1953-54. The *News Letter* for October 15 reported that there were then 121 television stations in operation in seventy-five cities serving 21,200,000 television-equipped homes. In its first annual report, the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television (NCCET) forecast that twenty-seven noncommercial stations would be on the air by the end of 1954. Meanwhile, Edward D. Madden, vice president of NBC, had predicted that 600 stations would be operating in 200 cities and reaching seventy-nine percent of all American homes by January 1, 1956.

The potential value of educational television loomed even greater when the Ford Foundation set up in Ann Arbor, Michigan, the Center for Educational Television, a nonprofit corporation of the foundation intended to improve the quality of educational television programs. Named assistant to the president of the center was Lyle M. Nelson, formerly of the University of Oregon and later to become a president of ACPRA.[79]

With television production quite costly, colleges in the larger cities were exploring possibilities for cooperative effort. Among the first to join forces were New York City's four municipal colleges—Brooklyn, City, Hunter, and Queens. The result was a twenty-six-week series of half-hour programs entitled "Panorama," started on October 24, 1953, over WABD-TV. As reported in the *News Letter*, "Panorama" featured students and teachers in live discussions of issues, methods, research, and problems in education. It was lauded by the New York *Herald Tribune* as "one of the most ambitious projects yet attempted in the field of educational television."[80]

The same issue of the *News Letter* announced two exciting developments in television. One concerned the first coast-to-coast compatible color telecast demonstrated by RCA early in November. The other revealed that RCA engineers had perfected a new system of recording television programs, in black and white or color, on half-inch-wide magnetic tape.

The most ambitious educational television project yet attempted was "The Search," aired in 1953-54 with the cooperation of twenty-six universities from coast-to-coast. The idea for "The Search" had originated nearly a year earlier with CBS writers who hoped to give viewers new insights into the increasingly-complicated problems of living. Ultimately, the program featured separate segments on the cooperating institutions, focusing on special projects they had undertaken in such fields as social science, medicine, science, engineering, and the arts.[81]

"Which college publicist had been the first to write and send out hometown stories?" was a question the *News Letter* sought to answer in its winter issues. P. Caspar

Harvey of William Jewell College appeared to be the first, with stories dispatched from Fort Hayes (Kansas) State College in the fall of 1914 when he was director of publicity there. However, the honor ultimately settled on Homer Dunham, director of publicity at Western Michigan College. He had produced hometown stories for Alma (Michigan) College back in 1912 when he was its publicity director as a student.[82]

When newspapers began using high-speed reproduction of news photos in four colors as part of their regular editions in the fall of 1953, they chose college activities as their initital subjects. The Washington *Post* claimed to be the first when it used a six-column, six-inch-deep, page-one picture of the Maryland-Georgia football game in its Sunday editions of October 11. The photo was taken at 2:15 p.m. the preceding day and printing started nine hours later. The Milwaukee *Journal* followed on October 25 with a large action photo taken during the Marquette-College of the Pacific game the day before. On November 7 the St. Paul *Dispatch* ran a four-color, page-one picture of the University of Minnesota's homecoming queen taken two nights earlier.[83]

To enable members to use their past issues of the *Quarterly* more effectively, Editor Wilcox published indexes he had compiled both by title and by names of authors in the July, 1954, issue. Some 202 individuals had been responsible for the 232 items published during the five-year period.[84]

The Michigan plan followed for programs at ACPRA's national convention reached near perfection in 1954. The annual meeting held in New York City's Roosevelt Hotel June 21-24 called for only one formal address, that by President Smith. Three symposia, "Advancing Man's Right to Knowledge," "The Social Sciences—a New Opportunity for Public Relations," and "Public Relations as a Force in American Society," were features for the general sessions. A series of thirty-two seminars related to fourteen different areas of educational public relations occupied the delegates during the first three days. Because the number of members bearing the title "assistant to the president" had been increasing rapidly in the last two years and now totaled forty-four, seminars were included on the convention program for these officers. The number of presidents and development directors had also grown, and nearly twenty percent of more than 450 persons registered for the convention attended the three seminars devoted to fund raising.[85]

One of the participants in the symposium titled "Advancing Man's Right to Knowledge," the convention theme, saw the function of the public relations director as being similar to that of the lawyer or doctor. "I feel that the function of a public relations counsel," said Myles Lane, former United States attorney for New York's Southern District, "is not to serve as a sounding board for the ideas of the college executives, or to act as a mere conduit, mouthing the words of others in the form of releases for the press. The proper function and the responsibility of a public relations representative is to advise and guide the college authorities in the same fashion as a lawyer counsels a client or a doctor advises a patient.

". . . the twin objectives in your role as public relations experts must be public understanding and financial support," Lane continued. "Lacking either or both, the future of the American college and university would be doomed to a quick and certain extinction. We are all agreed that public support can only be derived through public confidence. Public confidence is acquired neither by gift, nor by divine right. It is won in the court of public opinion, only after a severe trial under the most exacting conditions. It seems axiomatic that public confidence is as easy to lose as it is difficult to win. Therefore, it should be guarded as jealously and as vigilantly as one guards a priceless gem."[86]

Reports of officers and committees at the national convention indicated that ACPRA had enlarged its services not only for members but also to national organizations related to education. Patterned after other cooperative efforts in which ACPRA was engaged, a joint committee from ACPRA and the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy had been established to further a program of public relations for pharmaceutical education. Relationships expected to provide mutual benefits had also been established with the U. S. Office of Education, the Southern Association of Collegiate Registrars and Business Officers, the National Citizens Committee on Educational Television, the Association of American Medical Schools, and the American Association of Junior Colleges. Working relations were also being continued with the Association of American Colleges, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Higher Education Department of the National Education Association, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. As an indication of its appreciation of the assistance it was receiving from ACPRA, the Association of American Colleges announced that it would continue during 1954-55 to provide office space valued at $1,200 for ACPRA's national office and also contribute $1,000 toward office expenses.[87]

Cooperative efforts were also being promoted by the Sports and Medical-Public Health Sections of the Association. The former had built closer ties with the Football Writers Association and the newly-created Public Relations Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, while the latter had promoted better relations with the National Association of Science Writers as well as the Association of American Medical Colleges.[88] Although formal organization of the Development Section was still two years away, a Committee on Fund Raising and Development appointed by President Smith the preceding fall had been responsible for establishing with the Council on Financial Aid to Education a liaison which promised to be of increasing importance in future years. At the committee's suggestion, ACPRA's Board of Directors also approved the annual compilation and publication of a comprehensive report on educational philanthropy which would list by institutions the amounts, sources, and purposes of gifts and grants received by colleges and universities.[89]

Appreciating the need for ACPRA to have a public relations program in its own behalf, President Smith had named a Public Relations Planning Committee shortly after assuming her office. The chairman of that committee, A. W. Quattrochi of Western Reserve University, brought in a report emphasizing that ACPRA members, in promoting sound public relations practices for their own institutions, also had an obligation to maintain the same standards in the name of the Association.

"Respect must be earned and deserved," the committee report emphasized, "and when that is accomplished, good public relations are being developed. Let us be accepted not by the things we say about ourselves, but rather by the things we do, the ideals we represent, and, finally what we are."

Quattrochi's committee, after studying basic needs, had determined three main objectives: "(1) to promote greater understanding of our public relations programs among our own administrations and institutions, including all campus publics; (2) to promote among the general public a wider understanding of higher education's aims and principles; (3) in general, to advise ACPRA officers and members on how the Association can contribute more to the public's appreciation of higher education, and how we can enhance the professional status of public relations officers."[90] The Board of Directors instructed Quattrochi's committee to construct a specific plan for interpreting higher education to the public.

To enable the Board of Directors to review quickly past actions of the organization and thus insure better continuity and more productive deliberation, President Smith had requested VonderHaar in January to index and codify the minutes of the board and of the Association for the past ten years. The immediate past president reported that the work was well under way. Now 128 separate actions taken by the directors during five national conventions had been recorded on visible file cards along with additional material necessary to explain the actions.[91]

Although the 1954 convention ended with ACPRA Day at the United Nations on June 24, the last formal event was the annual dinner on the previous evening at which awards were announced, new officers installed, and the presidential address delivered.

Columbia University and Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas received the Association's awards for distinguished service to education. The latter was honored as "scholar, teacher, university president, statesman . . . and sponsor of the Fulbright Act which has encouraged the exchange of students and teachers between the United States and other nations of the free world." The former was recognized "for the manifold contributions of its eminent faculty and administration to American education," and especially for conceiving for its bicentennial year the program "interpreting the principle and supporting the thesis of 'Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof'." The Association's awards for outstanding achievement were conferred upon Horace Renegar of Tulane University, "distinguished servant of education during twenty-five years of public relations practice, past president of and outstanding contributor to this Association," and Louis H. Bell of Pennsylvania State University, "brilliant and unstinting servant of this Association, creator of its *News Letter* and former officer . . ."[92]

Installed as new officers along with Francis C. Pray, University of Pittsburgh, who had been named president-elect in 1953, were: president-elect, Bradford D. Ansley, Emory University; secretary-treasurer, Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., Washington University, reelected; and vice presidents, the Rev. Arthur L. Dussault, Gonzaga University, districts and membership; James R. Jordan, University of Iowa, sections; and Lynn Poole, Johns Hopkins University, publications and Association services. Pray announced that William E. Keys, University of Texas, would be editor of the *News Letter*, during 1954-55, and Jesse R. Long, University of Toledo, would be editor of the *Quarterly*, the October issue excepted. Dixon Johnson of the Oak Ridge (Tennessee) Institute of Nuclear Studies had earlier been named associate editor of the *Quarterly* with responsibility for the October issue covering proceedings of the 1954 convention.[93]

Both in her final report and in her presidential address, Mrs. Smith emphasized that "ACPRA's greatest days lie ahead."[94]

"There have been councils, conferences, and commissions studying how to meet all the profound and not-so-profound problems which beset higher education and with which we are all familiar," she said in concluding her address. "The findings and reports all come out the same—more education, more facts, better interpretation for governing boards, for faculties, for students, for alumni, for all the people. And these, my friends, as you well know, are the ingredients of public relations. Helping to meet this universal need is a test for all persons concerned with higher education, but it is particularly an area for professional service by the American College Public Relations Association. How the only public relations association in the field of higher education can better serve the interests of higher education is a question ACPRA proposes to study. Advice and counsel will be asked of top administrative officers, important educational association officers, trustees, business leaders, and experienced development and public relations consultants in and out of education. The report should be a working blueprint important for the future of higher education.

"None of this is new. It may be a little quaint to remind ourselves that the small flute is necessary to the swelling tones of the orchestra; to dream of building cathedrals instead of chiseling rock. But if we are to find and furnish the additional resources, human and financial, which higher education must have if it is to do the job society is expecting of it, its story must be interpreted with compelling ardor by every college and university to every community across this land. There is no danger that higher education will cease to function; the danger is that it will not be able to meet, effectively, the demands upon it."[95]

'Counselor to Higher Education'

Francis C. Pray's elevation to the presidency of the American College Public Relations Association came on the twentieth anniversary of his membership in the organization. When only two years a member, he had, while serving as assistant college editor at Massachussetts State College, become director of the Association's District I in 1937. Two years later he gained much wider attention as a contributing editor of the old *College Publicity Digest*. Now, after service in public relations posts with Union and Hofstra Colleges and the University of Pittsburgh and stints in various positions of leadership in ACPRA, he had accepted the Association's top job determined to expand the outlook of the membership and push actions and activities which would give the organization greater professional standing.

It could be said that ACPRA had now progressed beyond midstream. Founded as an organization for news bureau directors, it had after half a dozen years of discussion in the 1920s changed its name to American College Publicity Association. As duties expanded rapidly that name also seemed inadequate, but not until 1946 was the name changed again to reflect more clearly the broader scope of the average director's duties.

After more than a decade of discussion and negotiation, the Association was finally able in 1950 to establish a one-man national office. Progressive strengthening of the Association's structure followed, accompanied by the development of an increasingly large corps of professionals. Each year now the Association was facing greater opportunities, and occasionally pressures, to develop its role into one of service to the whole field of higher education rather than service merely to the practitioners belonging to it.

It was Pray who had urged that a special committee study the whole field and philosophy of college and university public relations and development, then recommend steps to make ACPRA increasingly responsive to the changing needs of higher education. The committee, with Pray as its chairman, had progressed with its assignment to the point where only financing for the project needed to be secured.

A White House Conference on Education at the Secondary Level had been held in 1950 and now plans were underway in Washington for a conference on Education Beyond the High School. During Pray's administration ACPRA offered its services to governors in promoting "White House conferences" at the state level, and in many states Association members were called in to assist. Soon after taking office Pray emphasized, in an open letter to ACPRA members, that the Association had "taken a long step forward" in adopting new bylaws at the New York convention. Under these bylaws and through the Board of Directors, henceforth to be composed largely of representatives elected by the districts and sections, future policies would be almost entirely in the hands of interested members.

"I pledge your newly-elected officers to that concept of control," he wrote, "and hope that we may have the interest of and participation by members which will make possible a realization of that concept. Members now have the machinery, literally, to make ACPRA what they wish."[96]

Marvin Topping, ACPRA's executive secretary, likewise emphasized the new opportunities and responsibilities created by the bylaws. "The general philosophy underlying the changes," he said, "was to make ACPRA more democratic, provide greater participation of members, and streamline its organization for more efficiency of operation. In implementing this philosophy greater emphasis, importance, and responsibility have been placed on the districts. . . . There are clear indications that this will be a year of broadening the scope of ACPRA's activities."[97]

A Happy New Year edition of the *News Letter* appeared on July 15, 1954—the day ACPRA's new fiscal year opened. In addition to recapping the New York convention and the advances it brought, the issue announced that G. Duncan Wimpress of the Colorado School of Mines had been named director for research; that Leota Pekrul of the Colorado School of Medicine and Charles Flynn of the University of Illinois would head the Association's Medical-Public Health and Sports Sections, respectively; and that the 1956 convention would be held at the Greenbrier Hotel in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia. Miss Pekrul resigned shortly and Elizabeth E. Griffin of the New York University-Bellevue Medical Center replaced her. Dates for the 1956 convention were later set for July 8-11 and Tom Bost, Jr., of the University of North Carolina and Lynn Poole of Johns Hopkins University, the current vice president for publications and Association services, were named convention director and program chairman, respectively.

As ACPRA opened its thirty-eighth year, a membership goal of 1,200 was set. Membership objectives, the Executive Committee decided, would be: first, to increase the number of institutions; secondly, to increase the number of active members; and thirdly, to increase other kinds of memberships—educational agency, associate, personal, student, and business. The Reverend Arthur Dussault, vice president for districts and membership, organized a committee of fifty-six members representing all areas of Association activity. When the fiscal year ended on July 14, 1955, membership stood at 1,196 as compared to 1,051 the preceding year.[98]

As one means of strengthening the districts and making their operation more successful, a set of model bylaws for districts was drawn under the direction of Father Dussault. For several years nearly all of the districts had been holding annual meetings, and all of them during 1954-55 or the following year adopted bylaws patterned after the model set. By this time it was not uncommon for attendance at meetings of larger districts to exceed 150 for programs placing special emphasis on techniques and assistance for newcomers. The practice of holding meetings jointly with those of American Alumni Council districts, pioneered in 1938 by the ACPRA district composed of Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and the Dakotas, was being followed by an increasing number of ACPRA districts. Newsletters were also being published by most of the districts. For economy and convenience, Father Dussault also began efforts to coordinate the scheduling of district meeting dates to enable ACPRA presidents to visit several districts on one trip. For years presidents had attended district meetings as they were able, either at their own expense or that of their institutions. But in December, 1954, ACPRA's Executive Committee adopted as policy the payment of travel expenses for the president or his delegated representative to every ACPRA district meeting.[99]

ACPRA's Board of Directors during 1954-55 also directed the Executive Committee to proceed with the organization of an American College Public Relations Association Foundation. Proposed by Stewart S. Howe of Illinois Institute of Technology, director for the annual convention coming up in Chicago, the foundation would enable ACPRA to seek gifts and grants with the usual income tax benefit accruing to donors. Eventually, the move to establish the foundation, after progressing toward completion, became unnecessary when the Internal Revenue Service granted the Association tax-exempt status in 1960.

It was in 1954-55 that ACPRA moved to establish a Development Section for members whose primary interest lay in the area of fund raising. The Association's Development Committee, headed by John Fields of the University of Southern California, proposed the establishment of such a section, and a meeting open to all development officers in the Association was held on the morning of June 29. Forty-one members signed a petition requesting ACPRA to authorize the organization of a special section "devoted to the technical aspects of development and fund-raising programs to be called the Development Section." The Board of Directors authorized the action later that day, and gave it formal recognition in 1955-56, after the new section's bylaws had beeen approved.

After the board took its action to recognize the Development Section, the Executive Committee voted to recommend to the president-elect that he appoint a committee which would, under the chairmanship of the vice president for sections and with representatives of all major interest areas within the Association, study all aspects of section organization and report back to the Executive Committee.

During 1954-55 the Association's Development Committee also completed arrangements for a project suggested a year earlier: an annual survey of gifts and grants made to American colleges and universities. The Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE) had cooperated on a pilot questionnaire and Fields reported on June 29 that ACPRA and CFAE were ready to make a nationwide survey with the latter organization underwriting the cost of the project.[100] Soon the American Alumni Council also became a sponsor of the project, an invaluable source of information on annual giving for all the country's insititutions of higher education.

To assure that the selection of sites for national conventions, now made two years in advance, would be done with greatest likelihood of satisfaction, the Executive Committee announced a new policy. Forms on which invitations for conventions could be submitted were being printed by the executive secretary. Henceforth, invitations had to be presented thirty days prior to the annual convention, after which they would be screened by the Executive Committee, then presented to the Board of Directors with recommendations.[101]

In 1957 ACPRA would be forty years old and the Executive Committee decided that this should be a time of celebration. The president was authorized to appoint a committee to plan the observance and Pray named Emerson Reck, now vice president of Wittenberg College, and a committee of fifteen to draw the plans.

The Executive Committee also believed that the time had come for ACPRA to study its awards program. Consequently, it voted to request the Awards Committee for 1955-56 to redefine the Association's purpose in giving awards, examine the criteria for all district and national awards and citations, including membership awards, draft the bylaws necessary to implement recommendations made, and report back to the Executive Committee.[102]

Several actions which later would be considered as advances for the Association were discussed during the Pray administration. One of these concerned the formation of special commissions to consider in depth certain areas of interest within the broad scope of educational public relations.[103] Another related to incorporation of the Association, an action which could provide certain legal and prestige benefits.

Still another related to revision of the bylaws, in most cases merely for the clarification of certain items. One change deemed advisable (but not made until another year had passed) was that calling for the fiscal year to begin August 1 and close on July 31 of the following year, rather than run from July 15 through July 14 as established in 1954. It was also proposed that the office of director of research be eliminated and that a Committee for Evaluation and Promotion of Research be established as a standing committee.[104]

For the first time in its history, ACPRA compiled its more important policies in a two-page report at the beginning of the publicaton which had been known since 1952 as *Membership Directory and Annual Reports*. Members and interested nonmembers could now determine quickly the Association's policies on such items as conventions, cooperation with other associations, district alignment, Association endowment, exhibits, expenses for officers, publications, Association publicity, resolutions, and special interest groups. The policy relative to cooperation with other associations read merely: "ACPRA has an established policy of encouraging cooperation with other educational associations through joint committees."

The policy on cooperation had been bringing increasing benefits to all concerned, and developed for ACPRA a reputation as the "public relations counselor to higher education." At the close of the 1954-55 fiscal year, Executive Secretary Topping was able to report that ACPRA "now has a working relationship through joint committee or otherwise with eleven national educational organizations."[105]

As President Pray indicated in his report to the membership at the 1955 convention,[106] ACPRA's program with other educational associations represented "a veritable alphabet soup of activities—AAC, AACP, AACTE, NCCET, CFAE, AAMC, NCAA, AAJC, etc."[*]

Another cooperative undertaking at that time in the planning stage was a newsletter to be published jointly by the Association of

---

[*] American Alumni Council, American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Citizens Commission for Education Television, Council for Financial Aid to Education, Association of American Medical Colleges, National Collegiate Athletic Association, and American Association of Junior Colleges.

American Colleges, the National Catholic Education Association, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and ACPRA. This newsletter would seek to present as concisely as possible for the busy college president information on those things of which he should be aware. The publication would also enable him to follow through to its source any subject of particular interest and relay information to other officers and faculty members. Foundation support was being sought for the project.

In April the joint committee of the Association of American Colleges and ACPRA met to discuss the financing of the Association's national office. The committee recommended a revision of the agreement scheduled to continue through August, 1956. The new agreement called for the discontinuance of the current subsidy of $1,000, but continuance of the arrangement whereby ACPRA handled publicity for the annual convention of the Association of American Colleges in return for office space. Because AAC notified ACPRA that it might need the office space the latter presently occupied, Topping was authorized to explore other location possibilities, preferably with the American Council on Education. Later the Association of American Colleges announced that it would be able to continue the current arrangement for the time being.[107]

ACPRA had never had an official seal. Members now felt one was needed, and Howard Curtis of Brown University, a district representative on the Board of Directors, was appointed to study the matter of a design and suggest the materials, such as letterheads and membership cards, which should bear the seal.[108]

Although brief, an item titled "Something New in College Giving" aroused widespread interest among ACPRA members when it appeared in the *News Letter* for January 15. The item drew attention to the January issue of *Harper's* in which a two-page advertisement announced the Corporate Alumnus Plan of the General Electric Educational and Charitable Fund. Described as "a unique approach to support for higher education," the plan was later adopted in principle by many corporations. Basically, General Electric was offering to match any gift up to $1,000 an employee made to his alma mater for its annual support.[109] Soon, the Columbia Broadcasting System announced that it would in 1955 give $32,000 to fourteen private colleges and universities in the first of a number of annual grants. Its gifts were meant to repay institutions for costs they had absorbed in educating men who had become CBS executives.[110]

In establishing the office of vice president for publications and Association affairs, the bylaws adopted in 1954 had provided no clear definition of the phrase, "Association services." After a study of possibilties, Lynn Poole, presently holding the new office, delineated the functions as follows: "(1) To serve as liaison between action groups and ACPRA; (2) to serve as a listening post for members and groups within the organization, and funnel the desires of members to the proper officer or group; (3) to serve as a catalyst for joint action between other officers and groups and ACPRA; (4) to originate activities which grow out of other duties."[111]

Similarly, the director of research, Duncan Wimpress, worked to establish the activities, functions, and duties of the Committee on Research which had been established without a clear definition of duties. He recommended that the committee: (1) serve as a source of information concerning past, present, and future research and writing in the field of public relations in higher education; (2) serve as a clearinghouse for material on research and writing in the field; (3) encourage the performance of original research in the area of public relations for higher education; (4) provide continuity through the years to research activities and writing in the field; (5) evaluate and make recommendations regarding the value of research projects in the field.[112]

News of the death of Robert W. Madry, president of ACPRA in 1933-34, was carried in the *News Letter* of May 1. Madry, director of the University of North Carolina News Bureau for thirty-two years and a former mayor of Chapel Hill, had died April 8, at the age of fifty-seven.

The enlarged interests and activities of ACPRA were reflected by the content of the *College Public Relations Quarterly* as well as by activities and reports of officers, committees, districts, and sections. In addition to its regular feature of three or four pages, "The Professional Bookshelf," the *Quarterly* presented in each issue a menu of ten or more articles on an increasingly wide variety of subjects.

"Public Relations Down to Earth," the lead article for the January issue of the *Quarterly*, was written by J. A. R. Pimlott, an Englishman. He observed, "There are probably more conflicting and nebulous claims about what public relations is and should be than any other important function of management."

"It is not altogether surprising that this should be so," continued Pimlott, author of *Public Relations and American Democracy*, published in 1951 by the Princeton University Press. "Although public relations is taking its place in management alongside well-established specialities like law, engineering, and accounting, and newer ones like advertising, salesmanship, and industrial relations, it is still in the early days of its evolution as a specialist function. It has come up fast; the very speed of the progress it has made is one reason for the confusion."

Pimlott said that "there are no pat qualifications to look for in a public relations executive or counselor. Thinking on this question," he continued, "has been quite inconclusive. At one extreme . . . are those who think that he should be a practicing social scientist with at least a working knowledge of economics, sociology, social psychology, and other human sciences. At the other extreme are those who stress personality and experience. . . .

"The one point on which the experts agree is the importance of keeping out of the clutches of charlatans, incompetents, headline wheedlers, and 'something-for-nothing' boys. The day when it will be possible to lay down more than the most general criteria for choosing men to fill responsible public relations posts is far in the future. This makes it especially important for management to be able to appraise shrewdly the methods and performance of its public relations people."

Direct and easy access to top management was considered by Pimlott to be essential for successful public relations work. "This is important," he emphasized, "not only because interpretation of the company to the public will hardly be effective unless it is based on an intimate and continuing aquaintance with policies as they develop, but also because the leading personalities are an important part of the material with which the public relations department works. . . .

"Where the relationship between the public relations chief and the top executives is close and cordial, he has opportunities for contributing to general policy beyond those which strictly arise from his departmental responsibilities. The able man will seize his chance, and public relations is likely to be of increasing importance in the future as a route to top executive positions. But the decisive factor will be the individual's general aptitude for management and not his skill as a communications specialist."[113]

Some new ideas about public relations were tied to ideas of long standing by Roger W. Bancroft, chairman of the Department of Education at State University Teachers College in Cortland, New York, in a *Quarterly* article titled, "The Best Part of Public Relations—Human Relations."

"Public relations," he wrote, "may be defined as the personality of the college; what other people think, including the concept that the responsibility for public relations lies with the total group, and necessitates the cooperation of the entire staff, from civil service employee to the president of the institution. . . . Public relations people should work diligently to develop a program of action which will encompass the entire staff. Relatively few of the people with whom we work in public relations hear what we say, most don't act accordingly. Often a lot of work by many people can be undone if one or two persons fail in their responsibility for establishing the personality of the college. . . .

"Practicing public relations is something of a skill. It can become something of a habit. The danger inherent in that is that the practice becomes perfunctory. . . . We should stop to look at public relations in terms of goals. Public relations people should decide that for about six weeks they would do nothing but work inside the doors of their own institutions. They would probably be totally amazed by what would be accomplished. I am sure that too much of the available time is being spent on incidentals, relatively meaningless. Public relations, to be successful, must be based on human relations. Human relations can be practiced only from within."[114]

When the convention for ACPRA's thirty-eighth year opened at Chicago's Drake Hotel on June 29, registrations totaled 714 members and guests, the largest number by far participating in an Association convention to that date. The heart of the program was again the seminars, thirty-nine of them on eleven different areas of interest. About 190 persons participated in these seminars. Dinner programs held by representatives of Protestant, Catholic, and junior colleges pushed the number of participants above 200.

For the first time in an ACPRA convention, the subject of adult education received major attention. Seven of the seminars dealt with that subject. Fund raising was again in the spotlight during six seminars, and external and internal relations were emphasized with four and three seminars, respectively. Other seminars dealt with the usual subjects—special events, radio and television, newspaper and magazine publicity, publications, audio-visual public relations, athletics, and medical-public health public relations. Subjects of the five addresses on the program ranged from "A Report on Russia" to "The White House Conference on Education."[115]

Because the Executive Committee and Board of Directors had attended to most of the Association's business as authorized under the new bylaws, only one general session was on the schedule and that lasted less than one hour. Each of the elected officers gave a brief report and Executive Secretary Topping reported on actions of the Executive Committee and Board of Directors. Announcement was made that Omaha had been selected by the Executive Committee as the site of the 1957 convention, and plans for the 1956 convention at White Sulphur Springs were sketched.

Secretary-Treasurer Osborn reported that ACPRA was in the best financial condition in its history. Thanks to the large increase in membership, Association income for the fiscal year was $26,598; expenses totaled $24,517. The Association's total assets—including $11,043 in the reserve fund and $1,084 in the Frankenberg Endowment Fund—had jumped more than $2,200 to $27,847.[116]

Bradford Ansley of Emory University was installed as president. The slate presented by the Nominating Committee of past presidents headed by E. Ross Bartley of Indiana University was accepted unanimously: president-elect, Lynn Poole; secretary-treasurer, James R. Jordan, University of Iowa; vice presidents, G. Duncan Wimpress, Colorado School of Mines, districts and membership; John E. Fields, University of Southern California, sections; and James W. Armsey, New York University, publications and Association services.[117]

ACPRA conferred only two awards at the Chicago convention. That for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education went to Eleanor R. Collier, of Boston University, the Association's first woman president and a long-time leader who had recently completed twenty-five years of service with both her university and ACPRA. The award for distinguished service to higher education was presented to the Council for Financial Aid to Higher Education "for leadership in interpretation of the financial needs of higher education, for programs, research, and publications which have led business and industry to accept the role of partner in the preservation of the American system of higher education."[118]

Now ACPRA itself became the recipient of an award for public service. The award was presented by the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television "for pioneering vision and outstanding public service in helping to bring to the American community the advantages of educational television."[119]

The fear that "so-called 'public relations' practices were muzzling and muffling our colleges" was expressed by one of the convention's speakers, Clarence Schoenfeld, a University of Wisconsin administrator best known to ACPRA members as the author of *The University and Its Publics* published the preceding year.

"It is my conviction," declared Schoenfeld, "that the real problem of the university today is not so much that fear has stopped it from freedom of utterance, but rather that misguided public relations policies have led to an absence of those disturbing, pioneering, provocative ideas which it is the responsibility of the American campus to foster. In their vital role as disturbers of the peace of mind of conventional and pedestrian listeners, professors must labor mightily against the dead weight of ghost writers bent on turning out 'safe and sane' platitudes.

". . . It is the business of the college to hold high above the tugs and pulls of the moment those ideas and ideals which are at the heart of Western culture. In so doing a college is bound, on occasion, to alarm the conservative and dismay the radical. When we public relations men encourage our institutions to knuckle under to every half-baked critic and predatory pressure group that calls for silence, we are betraying that pledge to 'cut a broad swath and shave close' which has built our universities. . . .

"For an institution as a whole, selective public relations is not the kind which comes from 100 percent blind surrender to donors, senators, or football coaches. It is a way of life, not an oath. It is a method, not a motto. The effective institution is the university which is criticizing as well as cooperating. It is as skeptical as it is loyal. It defends its right to object as strongly as it exercises its right to agree. This is the true American university—the institution which has selected out of American life all the things that appear to be admirable, true, and just, and matches its teaching of these things with research aimed at improving our world and our way of life."[120]

"What Is the Right Thing to Do?" was the title of Francis Pray's presidential address. It was also a question he asked frequently during the address after posing problems public relations people were facing every day.

"It is certain that we in public relations, and college presidents, too, have not given enough thought to the necessity to explain and make dramatic the processes of the mind, the effort to remember, the struggle for understanding, the discipline of research, and the search for values.

'The basic problem is one of values. We wouldn't cringe when we raise tuition a modest dollar or two a point if we were convinced that the public cared as much about education as it does about new automobiles and television sets.

"We wouldn't subsidize students out of the hides of faculty members, if we didn't somewhere have an almost guilty feeling that we can't afford to charge what education costs because nobody would be willing to pay the bill.

"What is the right thing to do about this problem?"

Pray also asserted that desegregation "is certainly the most dramatic problem facing education today. The problems of desegregation," he continued, "are not confined only to the South. In subtle ways they are all about us. What shall we do about them? . . . If we believe this [the Declaration of Independence assertion 'that all men are created equal . . .'], what is the *right* thing to do about segregation?"

Pray reminded his listeners that the Association had voted unanimously nearly a decade earlier not to hold a convention in a hotel where every member could not have equal treatment, and that the Board of Directors only two days earlier had reaffirmed this policy.

"As an Association we have committed ourselves," he said. "As individuals, we have to see to it that the right questions are asked. Then as public relations people we have to use every bit of professional skill we have to gain an acceptance for these answers. These things are obligations to us, as educators, and that is the right thing to do."

Pray declared that "the future holds almost unlimited opportunities for us in serving higher education. We have only to open our minds and go into overdrive with our imaginations," he asserted. "It will help also if we can open our hearts, and ask ourselves when we meet each new problem, 'Now what is the right thing to do?'

"Sometimes I get discouraged, and sometimes I get complacent. When I feel an extreme coming on, I reach into my files and get out an advertisement which appeared in 1912. It is an ad for an automobile, and it appeared in all the leading papers of the country. Here it is:

" 'This is our last model! With this year's new, 1912 automobile, we believe we have reached the LAST WORD in modern transportation. Our engineers assure us that this automobile is far superior to anything which has appeared on the market before this time. And they assure us that there can be nothing but minor improvements from this point on.

" 'The steering wheel has been moved to the left side; the wheels are now rubber-tired; new improvements in the Prest-o-lite system of lighting have been effected. A rear door has been added to insure the safety of your passengers.

" 'We are proud to offer you this newest sensation in transportation—the new, 1912, six-cylinder—automobile—at only $1,050.

" 'Note: Windshield, one-man top, self-starter, horn, and floor mats can be purchased for $400 additional'.

"Need I," Pray asked, "say more?"[121]

Royal K. Sanford, editor of the *Quarterly*, stated ACPRA's position well in the issue carrying a summary of the 1955 convention addresses and seminars. He said: "Our concern now is not with superficial problems but with profound ideas vital to higher education."[122]

Warnings And Challenges

Friends and colleagues of Brad Ansley—no one was ever heard to call him Bradford—described him as a "superb idea man and the best combination speaker-and-writer we have ever known."[123] ACPRA's records for 1955-56 provide ample evidence that he made good use of these talents to inform larger segments of the public about educational public relations, its problems, challenges, and responsibilities.

Ansley's first message to the Association's membership, however, spoke not of rewards. Rather it warned of the dangers inherent in forms of competition beginning to reveal themselves in the activities of some colleges and their public relations people.

"The immediate danger is beginning to appear in the rush among colleges to cash in on the growing interest of the business community," he wrote in the ACPRA *News Letter* for October 20, 1955. "This new mother lode of financial support is exercising a magnetic influence upon college administrators and the field is full of prospectors, bearing the academic equivalent of Geiger counters and other devices to uncover new sources of money.

"Now come two types: the private college developer who, not satisfied to rest his case upon the unquestioned and undeniable role of independent institutions in the American scheme of higher education, asks for support as a means of protecting his school against the 'inroads' of the tax-supported colleges and universities. And, the state-supported-school developer who, despite all the clear and compelling reasons for the adequate financing of state institutions, feels it necessary to make invidious reference to 'the little jerkwater colleges and church schools' which, he implies, ought to be allowed to die a decent death.

"This kind of competition is bad for everyone. ACPRA and ACPRA members can consider themselves a task force commissioned to encourage a positive sales approach upon educational money raisers. The good salesman knows he will never get anywhere by running down his competitor's product. Clean competition is not only good public relations, it's good business!"

Offering "Some Thoughts for Reflection in 1956," Ansley in the *News Letter* for January

15, 1956, saw both reward and danger ahead for ACPRA members in the immediate future.

"Virtue in our business can hardly be described as self-rewarding," he wrote. "On the contrary, the pitiful fact is that, as college public relations and development people do a better and better job, they store up for themselves not treasures in heaven, but problems for next year. During the twelve months past, we have brought public and private knowledge about higher education to the highest level in history. People who a decade ago would have considered educational problems something for 'the professors to worry about' now have a new concept of the way in which education is directly related to the whole future of our nation. . . .

"[Now] let us be prepared to make certain that familiarity does not become contempt. We cannot create knowledge without inviting interest, and we cannot invite interest without risking action. . . . For 1956, let us resolve to give sober thought to our role as interpreters and influencers—to the broader and deeper responsibility we share for helping our institutions deserve the interest they have created and for translating information into conviction and action."

To give a broader segment of the population an idea of opportunities in public relations, Ansley took to the air on October 29, 1955, as the featured participant on an ABC television program, "Tomorrow's Careers." The program, billed as "a demonstration of the part which public relations plays in our total private, business, commercial, and educational life," was moderated by Lynn Poole, ACPRA president-elect, who had already won international recognition for his pioneering efforts in educational television.[124]

Journalists of the country were also told by Ansley through *Quill*, the official journal of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalism society, that the college public relations field was "neither gold mine nor graveyard."

"College public relations," said Ansley in opening an article titled "College Publicist Has A Real Job—and Fun!" "is rapidly developing into a full-blown profession." And this, he added, had come "from a standing start only a couple of decades ago."

"At the risk of sounding maudlin," Ansley wrote in his concluding paragraphs, "it strikes me that the satisfaction of being associated with an endeavor whose aim is the betterment of the order of things, and of being in a position to help mold the objective of that endeavor is no small thing.

"College public relations calls every day for more ingenuity and imagination than any routine reportorial assignment I ever saw. And it pays off in those dividends of the spirit whose rate of exchange is not convertible in terms of money but of inward satisfaction."[125]

During his presidency, Ansley probably made his greatest impact through his speeches at the district conventions, all twelve of which he attended. Over and over during his convention swings, he emphasized that competence must be the watchword of ACPRA and its members.

"I am convinced," Ansley told district meeting audiences, "that our rise to the top levels of management and administration will not be upon the basis of organization charts or definitions or self-conscious appraisals of our own importance but upon the basis of our competence in the fundamental skills we are expected to possess. . . .

"I have observed that I have served best and most usefully, and have been most appreciated and leaned upon by my employers, as I have performed most successfully that art of communication which involves the simple expression of abstract ideas, the synthesis of concepts which educators are uniquely able to create but which they are so often unable to articulate. And in serving as the catalyst to bring form and simplicity and concreteness to the philosophy out of which educational policy springs, I have found a deeply satisfying and, I think humbly, important and significant place in the top councils of my university.

"Let me make it clear to you that I use the typewriter as a symbol of the working tools of the public relations man—not as the whole kit! Our communications activity is a two-way street over which ideas flow in many directions and forms. We may use the typewriter, but we may also use the camera or the microphone or the lecture platform, or just the power of suggestion. . . . But in all we do, let us keep constantly in mind that common denominator which underlies all our efforts—clear and effectual channels of communication, linking us internally and externally with those well-springs of understanding and support which are vital to the institutions we serve.

"I commend to you, therefore, as a worthy goal for our personal and organizational striving the improvement of that competence which will fit us to be leaders in the solution of the staggering yet enormously challenging problems of our mutual future. If we do, ACPRA will grow in importance and in service and so will we."[126]

As Ansley assumed office following the Chicago convention, the problems faced by ACPRA seemed much the same as in recent years—organizational matters, the Association's "national posture," and finances.

Organizationally, the Association was still wrestling with the problem of how to develop that structure which would best serve the membership. At the same time, it was endeavoring to get a clearer conception of the role of the national office and its executive secretary. Since 1946 Association membership had more than doubled—from 518 to 1,196—and now included in its ranks "all kinds of folks from all kinds of institutions," a fact indicated by the titles—some twenty-six different ones—held by members. As a result of this diversity the sectional organization had developed, first around sports and medical affairs and more recently development. Soon, a communications section would also emerge. At the same time, effort was being made to strengthen the district program, an endeavor which would bear especially good fruit for the Association during 1955-56 and the years following. Lastly, so far as organization was concerned, the Association's Board of Directors and Executive Committee were taking a new look at the purpose of the national office, and were finding greater potential in it as a medium for leadership and cohesion.

The Association's "national posture," as the organization's leaders viewed it, still left much to be desired. "ACPRA," Ansley recalled later, "was rapidly growing out of the stage of being a knitting society for old friends or a purely 'how to do it' professional forum, but we weren't acting like it. Important winds were blowing in higher education . . . [but] when we in ACPRA were called upon to be of help, it was as a bunch of publicists who might get something in the papers about decisions and activities, *after* the fact."[127]

During the Ansley administration, ACPRA took several steps to be discussed later which would help to gain it recognition as a creative and influential voice among members of the educational family.

Considering the problem of finances, the Association's leaders began to study the dues structure and also to cast about for outside sources of income. Committees which had first functioned during the Smith and Pray administrations would soon be rewarded with a grant from the Ford Foundation which would make possible one of the Association's major achievements of the 1950s, the Greenbrier Conference of 1958.

Because of the financial crunch an increasing number of colleges and universities were facing, the organization of a Development Section within ACPRA and the examination of problems involved in fund raising cried out for immediate attention. After a two-year study of organizational need, development officers from seventy-five institutions had formed a Development Section at the Chicago convention with A. C. Van Dusen, Northwestern vice president, as chairman. The basic objectives of the section as stated in its constitution were: "(1) to serve as a professional organization for those who work in college and university fund raising; (2) to seek ways and means of strengthening and integrating organized college and university development and fund raising across the nation; (3) to be a clearing house for ideas, assistance and guidance to members of the profession and a major source of fund raising and development information for the public as well as the colleges and universities; (4) to sharpen and improve the professional techniques and know-how of practitioners whose primary responsibility is development and fund raising."[128]

The increasing emphasis on fund raising naturally led to more space for articles on this subject in *College Public Relations Quarterly*. Veterans in the field tried to give guidance to the many newcomers, a large number of whom had had no previous experience in the public relations field.

"University development, properly defined," wrote J. L. Zwingle, Cornell University vice president, "begins with university planning, moves into general university public relations (or self-interpretation), and then into fund raising. . . . The functions of planning, of interpretation, and of fund raising must go on simultaneously Yet increasing self-consistency among the three must be constantly attempted.

"What is the proper function of an officer 'in charge of development'?" Zwingle continued. "Is it primarily that of fund raising? On the contrary, it is primarily to interpret the aspirations of the university and to encourage consistency between dollars received, dollars spent, and the priority of needs within the institution. Hence it is urgent—more, it is essential—to ascertain the common aspirations of the university's faculty for its university. I speak of *common* aspirations because, first of all, a university will be only as significant as its faculty aspires to make it. No amount of urgency in any other quarter will substitute for this factor. . . .

"Clearly it is not a function of the development office to formulate the curriculum, the program, or the future course of the institution. The development office is at best a useful servant of the other creative elements of the institution. Good public relations do not arise merely by the repetition of news about the university, nor of pleas for loyalty among the alumni, nor importunate seeking of funds from the munificent. To have meaning, there must be a creative interplay between the development staff on one side and the university faculty on the other. . . .

"Let us bear in mind that in fund raising there are no windfalls," Zwingle concluded. "Apparent windfalls have their beginnings sometimes in obscure events. The institution which receives adequate financing, however, is the one which has put itself in a position to deserve it, and which has done an adequate job of representing itself to the public upon which it has a claim. This is an enterprise which requires the orderly participation of every member of the university."[129]

Writing on "Support for Higher Education" in a *Quarterly* article, Everett H. Hopkins, vice chancellor for development at Washington University, said: "To a very large extent the success or failure of the fund-raising efforts will depend upon the effectiveness of the institution's total performance, including all aspects of public relations. However, outstanding performance in all these areas will not, of and by itself, raise funds for an institution. It will go a long way toward creating and fostering a favorable climate, which is absolutely essential to fund-raising success, but considerably more is called for."[130]

Hopkins then listed fifteen essestials for successful fund raising: (1) an impelling case to present to constituents; (2) a survey to determine the climate for the undertaking; (3) a well-conceived plan which will provide careful preparation, proper organization, adequate indoctrination of all participants, careful selection and rating of prospects, solicitation, recurring analysis, and frequent reporting to all interested participants and officials; (4) maximum participation in the overall program by faculty, students, alumni, "and all of the competent volunteers you can get"; (5) business and civic leaders willing to assume real leadership in the long-range program; (6) top leadership from the trustees, directors, or regents; (7) a budget and staff commensurate with the size of the job to be done; (8) realization that fund raising "is not a sporadic activity but consistent, persistent, and long-range with no letup except for sequential periods of relative emphasis on the various aspects of the problem"; (9) consideration of every phase of institutional fund raising as a public relations activity; (10) having the institution's own "house in order" from a business management standpoint; (11) activities which will serve, not merely cultivate and inform, those from whom financial support is being sought; (12) advance determination of a series of public relations targets which give promise of creating confidence in the institution among the right people and stimulating their support; (13) looking for special gift prospects, studying them carefully, and being certain they are "properly cultivated" and ultimately called on by the right person or persons; (14) getting first, as an inspiration to others, the support of members of "the immediate institutional family—alumni, faculty, students, parents of students, and especially the members of the board of trustees"; (15) giving personal attention to donors through "thank-you" letters, periodic follow-ups, invitations to campus events, and other means of showing appreciation.

Regional workshops on specific fund-raising problems were planned by the Development Section leaders from the start and the first of these was held in Highland Park, Illinois, on March 16, 1956. With sixty-five persons in attendance from seventeen states, the District of Columbia, and Canada, the workshop gave its attention to the general subject of "Corporate Support for Higher Education." It also broke down into six groups to discuss "Institutional Preparation for a Program of Corporate Solicitation," "Cultivation of Corporate Prospects," "Organizing and Staffing for an Adequate Program of Corporate Solicitation," "The Solicitation Interview," "Keeping Contacts with Donors," and "Education-Industry Relationships." Stewart S. Howe of Illinois Institute of Technology was chairman of the committee which planned this pioneering activity and Everett Hopkins served as moderator, then as editor of the twenty-six-page summary of proceedings.[131]

The import of the new Development Section on ACPRA is reflected in the record growth in membership in 1955-56. Membership for the year, as reported by Executive Secretary Marvin Topping, climbed to 1,388, compared to 1,196 the preceding year. Of this number more than 300 were members of the new Development Section.[132]

ACPRA's efforts to improve its "posture" and gain recognition as "the creative and influential voice of an important segment of the educational family," [133] bore considerble fruit during 1955-56. In his annual report, Topping was able to say that the Association had continued working relationships with eleven national associations in higher education, had been accepted as a constituent member of the American Council on Education, had assisted in the White House conference held November 28-December 2, and by invitation was currently working with other associations on the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.[134]

Its largest contribution of the year to this committee, formed to organize a nationwide public information and public relations campaign on behalf of higher education, came in July, 1956. A committee comprised of James Armsey, James Jordan, Lynn Poole, Francis Pray, and Ansley furnished in a seventeen-page memorandum an outline for a comprehensive program of communications for the effort.[135] As a result of this memorandum, the Association would later be called on to perform a larger service. In addition, the Association, through its Medical Section, helped to promote National Medical Education Week, much as it had for twenty years aided in promoting American Education Week.[136] And as earlier reported, six members of ACPRA were included on the National Education Committee of the Public Relations Society of America, at that time exploring possibilities for assisting colleges and universities offering or planning to offer courses in public relations.[137]

The most important cooperative undertaking of the year, however, saw the Council for Financial Aid to Education and ACPRA launching an annual survey of educational philanthropy. This effort had first been discussed in 1953 but failed to win approval. By June, 1955, the value of such a survey had become apparent and a decision was made to proceed. The initial survey revealed that an estimated half billion dollars had been received by participating institutions in 1954-55.[138]

Thus ACPRA could indeed report a definite growth in prestige. However, a study made by A. Westley Rowland, at that time news editor at Michigan State University and later an ACPRA president, emphasized that the Association was still falling short of achieving one of its major objectives: to advance the cause of higher education in general.[139]

"The higher rated objective for public relations . . . is building and holding good will for the institution," Rowland said in reporting returns from 272 institutions. At the same time he pointed out that only two representatives of the participating institutions had indicated that their philosophy had anything to do with the development of higher education in general and only four had given first rating to the objective of acquainting the public with the problems of higher education. Other questions meant to determine the concern of institutions with the general public relations of higher education revealed only a trifle more interest.

"On the basis of the evidence," declared Rowland, "this writer believes that ACPRA and its member institutions have, as yet, failed significantly to 'advance the cause of higher education in general'. It is also the belief of this researcher that this failure is crucial and that it must be remedied immediately if ACPRA is to hold a place of influence in higher education."

Rowland's sharp criticism led the Board of Directors and Executive Committee to focus attention on additional steps needed to strengthen the Association and make its voice heard among those organizations truly concerned with higher education in general. The Advertising Council campaign emerged, designed to draw attention of the general public to the burgeoning financial problems of colleges and universities. And one of the first acts of Lynn Poole as he assumed the mantle of presidential leadership in July, 1956, was to name a committee to study the future of ACPRA. Three past presidents—Pray, VonderHaar, and Brandon—and Everett Hopkins composed the committee whose work would provide one of the landmarks in Association history.[140]

The need to expand services to its members and to higher education in general posed the usual problem of money. Shortly after Rowland's article appeared, President Ansley appointed a committee "to study the dues structure of ACPRA in relationship to the demands being made upon the organization and the opportunities for expanded service open to it." Naming the committee with Edward VonderHaar as chairman, Ansley said that the dues problem, as he saw it, had three dimensions.

"First," he said, "great opportunities await our vision and initiative to serve the cause of higher education and to extend the role of ACPRA as a leader and spokesman in the whole broad area of educational organization. Second, we need to broaden and deepen the service we render our own members in helping them to grow professionally. Third, it is time for a reappraisal of our financial setup to determine whether fiscal organization and planning are keeping pace with the changing nature of our Association.

"In the latter case, of course, I refer to the rapidly emerging section organizations, the increasing emphasis on district activities, growing demands for cooperative effort with groups like the Council for Financial Aid to Education, the possible formation of an American College Public Relations Foundation, etc."[141]

As Ansley indicated, activity in the districts was at a new high. All districts had held conferences during the year, in virtually every case with increased attendance. In a project to eliminate the old numerical district designations, eight districts had chosen names and the remaining four had committees charged with recommending names in the next few months.* The new district names were: New England District (I), Middle Atlantic (II), Mason-Dixon (IV), Southeastern (V), V-Eye (VI), Sky High (XI), Pacific Northwest (XIII), and Mountains (XIV). By this time eight of the districts were publishing their own newsletters and two more were planning to begin such publications in the fall. Four districts were now operating under formalized bylaws and two others had committees drawing up similar sets of rules.

---

* Two districts, III and VII, previously had been merged with others.

Duncan Wimpress, vice president for districts and membership, was able to report that the first draft for a district officers' manual had been drawn. It would contain model district bylaws, an outline of duties for the several officers, suggestions on operation of district conventions, etc. To permit easy addition of materials it would be set up in loose leaf form.[142]

Through *College Public Relations Quarterly* ACPRA during 1955-56 continued to make one of its larger contributions to members. In addition to editorials and book reviews, an even forty articles were published on a wide variety of subjects ranging from "We Outlawed 'Cheesecake' and Made It Pay" to "Public Relations Aspects of Academic Freedom." Public relations officers furnished more than one-fourth of the articles but college presidents and deans, faculty members, alumni secretaries, information officers, magazine editors, development officers, radio and television executives, scriptwriters, and sports publicists were also included among the authors.

In a digest for the *Quarterly* of his doctoral dissertation called "The Growth and Development of Public Relations Programs in American Colleges and Universities" Robert C. Davidson, director of public relations at the University of Southern California, traced the growth of college public relations through 1955.

"An analysis of the histories of colleges and universities," Davidson wrote, "indicates that public relations problems, although not identified as such until the 1900s, have always existed, with the first problems occurring at Harvard, the nation's oldest institution of higher learning.

"At the beginning of Harvard's second academic year in 1639, Master Eaton, who had been given the task of operating the college by the community, made the grievous error of beating his assistant with a walnut tree cudgel. . . . Thomas Shepard rushed in from the parsonage next door to save the poor man's life, and the magistrate hailed Eaton into court for assault. This early evidence of a public relations problem had rather serious effects upon America's only college. Eaton was dismissed as a result of his outburst, and the doors of Harvard College remained closed for an entire academic year.

"Among the numerous other incidents of a public relations nature contained in the literature are those concerning student riots," Davidson continued. "Princeton was the scene of a 'Reign of Terror' during the years 1802-1828, with students burning college buildings, leading demonstrations in the local community, and rebelling against the faculty. Harvard also faced this problem, especially when the Class of 1823 staged the 'Great Rebellion'. Final dispensation proved severe when, on the eve of commencement, forty-three students of a class of seventy were expelled."

Davidson learned that the first course in public relations offered by an American college was given at New York University in 1923. By 1945 only twenty-five colleges and universities were offering work in the area. Most significant developments in college public relations, Davidson found, had come between 1945 and 1955.

"In 1946," he wrote, "the ACPRA first used the term 'public relations' in its title; more courses were offered in the area of public relations by colleges and universities; publicity programs became a part of a broader public relations concept; public relations programs used improved techniques of communications to reach their well-analyzed publics; and public relations personnel in many institutions found themselves on the policy-making level."

As a part of the research for his study, Davidson had polled members of ACPRA's 1954-55 Board of Directors for their answers to this question: "What do you consider to be the most significant developments in college and university public relations since 1945?" He reported that a summary of their replies included the following: "A growing awareness on the part of colleges and universities of the value of and need for well-planned, well-organized public relations programs; the growth of the development phase of public relations. . . which combines public relations and fund raising in one department; the acceptance by college and university administrators of public relations on the policy-making level; the steady growth of public relations as a profession; a general broadening of the scope of public relations activities; and the movement towards a more scientific approach in the field of communications."

As a result of his study, Davidson concluded that college and university public relations programs, although making rapid strides in recent years, were "still actually in their infancy with much of the activity carried out as a part of the programs considered by many as nothing more than old-fashioned press agenting."

"Much of the apparent confusion existing in the public relation field today concerning its scope and purpose," he declared, "has come as a result of the many different ways in which the term 'public relations' has been defined. The majority of the public relations problems facing colleges today also faced institutions of higher education in prior years, but in recent years these problems have become more complex, requiring improved techniques for solution."[143] Davidson's observations were destined to give valuable help to the Committee on the Future of ACPRA soon to be appointed.

Lending weight to Davidson's statement that "significant developments" had been made in college public relations between 1945 and 1955 was a survey made by Stewart Harral, director of public relations studies at the University of Oklahoma. His survey revealed that twenty-eight schools and departments of journalism were offering major programs in public relations in 1955 and nine others were planning expansion of their offerings in this field. A Harral survey four years earlier had reported that only twelve schools and departments had major programs.[144]

When ACPRA's 1956 convention opened at the Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, on July 8, 661 delegates were on hand and an estimated 100 guests and panelists were present for part or all of the three-day session.[145]

W. Homer Turner, executive director of the United States Steel Foundation, and Arthur Adams, executive director of the American Council on Education, were principal speakers at the general sessions. Turner, whose foundation would give ACPRA substantial grants in the next eighteen years, told the delegates that they faced a fundamental challenge in the current atmosphere of reexamination of education and its place in American life and philosophy.

"In such a time of soul-searching," he said, "leadership may arise either from within or without the colleges. Certainly, those who have the best interests of education in mind desire that the required leadership shall arise from the campus, and public relations people should be in the vanguard in developing such leadership. . . . In meeting the current reexamination of education, the educational institutions could do nothing wiser than make public relations a part of their top general policy level."[146]

Adams, who would before the convention's close receive the Association's award for distinguished service to higher education, emphasized that "successful public relations depends upon integrity, sincerity, knowledge, conviction of the worth of the educational process, and identification of public relations with the educational force.

"If the program is sound and the people involved are of high quality, the money will be provided," he continued. "Never has financial failure come if the program was thought through all the way."[147]

ACPRA's Board of Directors in 1955 had recommended that the Association incorporate but the Executive Committee at a meeting in October decided against such action. At a later meeting the Executive Committee took steps to assure adequate financing for future conventions with safeguards for accounting and assurance that moneys from dues now charged by the Development Section would be kept clearly separate from Association funds. These steps called for (1) the national convention budget to be approved by ACPRA's Executive Committee; (2) the executive secretary to be the convention treasurer; (3) all convention expenditures to be authorized by the convention director within the approved convention budget; (4) standard multiple forms to be used to assure accurate accounting and control of convention income and expense; (5) convention funds to be accounted for as Association funds.[148]

Over a period of months preceding the convention, James Armsey, vice president for publications and Association services, had made at President Ansley's request a thorough-going appraisal of the Association's publications policies. Then he prepared specific recommendations for consideration by the Executive Committee. As a result of his report, the *News Letter* was discontinued at the end of 1956, and in its place a news and feature magazine—"a true service magazine for members in all phases of educational public relations"—was established. No longer would editors be elected to serve on a volunteer basis. The national office was charged with the duties of publisher, and the executive secretary was authorized to employ a full-time managing editor to work under his supervision. As in the past all members of the Association were to receive publications without charge. The new magazine would carry advertising at rates established by the Executive Committee.[149]

In his report, Secretary-Treasurer James Jordan revealed that the net worth of the Association stood at $40,963. This was an increase of more than $13,100 over the preceding year and nearly four times the organization's net worth of $11,158 shown in 1951 at the end of the first year with a national office.[150]

After six years as the Association's first executive secretary, Marvin Topping announced that he would be resigning as of August 14 to become vice chancellor for development and public relations at Nebraska Wesleyan University. The committee named as his successor W. Noel Johnston, assistant to the president at Pratt Institute.[151]

Awards were presented at the annual convention to Arthur Adams and to the Ford Foundation for distinguished service to higher education. Citations for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education were given to Francis C. Pray and Josef F. Wright. Pray's citation was awarded "for widening the horizons of the American College Public Relations Association through his imaginative concepts, his constant search for high standards, and the broad scope of his interpretive activities in the area of educational public relations." Wright, about to retire after thirty-seven years as head of the public relations office at the University of Illinois, was cited "for his years of service both to the American College Public Relations Association and the University of Illinois during which he has been an undeviating pioneer and leader in the interpretation of higher education, inspiring in his associates the highest ideals and objectives in educational public relations."[152]

James R. Jordan, director of university relations at the University of Iowa and an officer in ACPRA since 1954, was named president-elect at the convention's annual business session, taking the place of Lynn D. Poole of Johns Hopkins University who moved up to the presidency. Other officers elected were: secretary-treasurer, Howard S. Curtis, Brown University; vice presidents, A. C. Van Dusen, soon to become vice chancellor for planning and development at the University of Pittsburgh, sections; G. Duncan Wimpress, Colorado School of Mines, districts and membership, reelected; James W. Armsey, New York University, publications and Association services, reelected. After Armsey resigned in early fall to join the Ford Foundation, Willima E. Keys, University of Texas, was named to take his place. San Francisco was chosen as the 1958 convention site and June 23-29 was set as the time for the fortieth anniversary convention to be held in Omaha.[153] Robert McGranahan of the University of Omaha, was named director for the convention.

President Ansley in his farewell address at the convention threw a final challenge to the Association and his colleagues.

"ACPRA is, in midsummer 1956, in some respects a microcosm of America higher education," he declared. "There are, among our number, individuals of every degree of experience, or competence, and of status. We represent institutions of almost every imaginable kind; we hold jobs as varied and as different as we ourselves are varied and different. There has been brought together into this organization a fellowship so heterogeneous that, in some ways, our mere presence here is almost incredible!

"Four common threads run through our often complicated relationships: (1) We believe in the traditional duality of American higher education—that is a strong and unfettered system of public institutions financed largely by taxation, drawing strength from and in turn supporting a great complex of free nonpolitically-controlled, independently-financed private colleges and universities. (2) We believe our institutions, regardless of label, belong to the people. (3) All of us give at least lip service and most are actually committed to the proposition that what is good for one institution must, in the long view, almost invariably benefit all institutions. (4) We believe organizations, including ACPRA, are a means to an end and not an end in themselves.

"Following these ideals we will become more adequate people personally and professionally through the Association. What is far more important, the contribution which can be made through the accumulated impact of our creative energies will place ACPRA in a position of major importance in the structure of organized higher education, whatever the patterns of the future may produce.

"We must have the courage to dare because the opportunities for constructive service which await us will not unfold for the timid, the smug, or the laggard . . . time and tide stand ready to serve the daring and courageous."[154]

8

Appraising the Association

Plans to Study 'Third Estate'

The year 1956-57 has been described as one of transition and change in ACPRA's history. An officer of the period described it in yet another way: as "a year of groundbreaking, foundation-laying, underbrush-clearing."[1] All of these phrases aptly described the year which started with a new and enlarged staff in the national office, a new publications policy, new goals for achievement, and a new philosophy of service. At the very beginning the officers sensed that the business of the year loomed all too large to cover adequately in the usual two sessions of the Executive Committee, and dates for three two-day meetings were consequently established. Over and over during those meetings the officers asked themselves: "How can the needs of the public relations and development people composing ACPRA best be served by the Association?"[2]

The president for this highly productive year was Lynn Poole, the male member of the man-wife team frequently referred to as "the prolific Pooles." With Gray, his wife of eleven years, Lynn had started in 1952 to turn out a successful string of books, most of them on the basic sciences. Devoted to such diverse subjects as insect-eating plants, icebergs, volcanoes, space, carbon 14, caves, fireflies, and "weird and wonderful ants," the Pooles in the next fifteen years produced twenty-seven volumes, which were translated into no fewer than forty-eight languages. In most books Lynn did the first draft and Gray, formerly a newspaperwoman and free-lance writer, did the final rewriting. Asked about possible problems faced in their joint efforts, Lynn wryly remarked:

> "The main problem we have is people getting our names wrong. I keep getting mail addressed to 'Miss Lynn Poole' and she gets mail and phone calls for 'Mr. Gray Poole'."[3]

ACPRA's growing emphasis on television could be traced in part to Poole's pioneering efforts. The Johns Hopkins "Science Review," which he originated in 1948 and produced for seven years, had brought him nineteen awards and a call to serve as a consultant to the British Broadcasting Corporation. Two other television series which he originated, "Tomorrow's Careers" and "John Hopkins File 7," also brought him half a dozen awards.[4]

One of Poole's first acts as ACPRA president broadened the scope of activity for a committee first named early in Veta Lee Smith's administration "to make a thorough study of the Association and its services." Fran Pray had served as the group's first chairman and soon it became known as the "umbrella committee," because all problems seemed to find a place under its spread. As the committee weighed developments, tested the opinions of members, and deliberated during the next three years, it always found itself in agreement on one fundamental point: "The problems of the Association were but a reflection of a basic problem that existed on the college and university campus. The whole administrative area in which we function in our individual institutions needed a new and thorough scrutiny. This was a problem of all higher education as well as the American College Public Relations Association."

Poole now invited Everett H. Hopkins, vice chancellor for university development at Washington University in St. Louis, to head the study committee. He named as additional members Arthur L. Brandon, New York University; James Jordan, University of Iowa; Lyle M. Nelson, now at the University of Michigan; Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., Washington University; Francis C. Pray, University of Pittsburgh; Edward P. VonderHaar, Xavier University; and W. Noel Johnston, and himself, *ex officio*.

"It appears," Poole charged the committee, "that the greatest service ACPRA could do for higher education is to conduct a thorough, scholarly, and objective study of what we might term the 'Third Estate' in education. This 'Third Estate' comprises what has up to now been regarded as fringe areas of academic activity. . . . These areas are ill-defined, unstable, and uncoordinated. In this 'Third Estate' we find student services, alumni affairs, fund raising, admissions, placement, and the interpretive functions.

"Presidents realize that the excellence of the academic function and the business operation alone is not enough to insure the perpetuation and improvement of the American system of higher education. Ultimately, its growth and development and success, and the meeting of its obligations to American society will depend on the degree to which the broad American public understands and is willing to support what higher education does in both public and private institutions.

"Each institution is attempting to solve this problem without the success needed for such an important function. Schools both large and small, private and public, north and south and east and west, are exploring different patterns of operation for this 'Third Estate' in education. Because of this there is real need for a study in depth of the existing patterns of this 'Third Estate' in an effort to outline these patterns."[5]

The first major change effected by ACPRA in 1956-57 was that in staff. On September 1, W. Noel Johnston, the new executive secretary, shoved open the door of the Association's headquarters at 726 Jackson Place to find a pile of over 300 letters. The office had been closed since mid-August when Marvin Topping left for his new job at Nebraska Wesleyan, and the letters had been dropped through the mail slot and lay unopened against the door. By September 15 the office was in full swing. New Assistant Director and Editor Ben Morton had begun work and Secretaries Florence Whittington and Susan Hanna were recruited. By that time also ACPRA had received notice from its landlord, the Association of American Colleges, that the space it had used rent-free for six years was now needed and the Association should look elsewhere for headquarters. Soon three large rooms were found in the American Council on Education Building at 1785 Massachussetts Avenue, N. W., to replace the two small ones which had been the Association's home since 1950. In its new headquarters ACPRA had as its immediate neighbors seven other educational groups—the American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, American Association of State Universities, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, American Alumni Council, and the National Catholic Education Association.[6] Getting to know people, not only in the ACE building but in other related organizations, became one of Johnston's first projects. The Association of American Colleges, long-time patron as well as first landlord, helped by holding a special luncheon at which representatives of twenty-five associations and agencies were guests to meet Johnston and Morton.[7]

The move to the new national office, however, was not accomplished until November 2 and the front-page photo on the final issue of ACPRA *News Letter* dated November-December gave some idea of handicaps under which the new staff was working. Most of the new furniture and equipment had not yet arrived, and the executive director was shown seated on a lone chair making a phone call—the phone and phone book both resting on the floor for want of a better place.

Although the national office was having transition problems, the Association's Executive Committee was busy and most of the decisions made at an October meeting in Washington broadened the scope of national office responsibility. Poole reported that an application would be made to the Ford Foundation for a grant to help ACPRA's Survey Committee do a thorough-going job. He considered the work of this committee the largest single job facing the Association. He therefore said that Chairman Hopkins would go ahead whether or not the grant was received but that the amount of money available would have to determine the approach.[8]

By the time the Executive Committee held its second meeting five months later, Hopkins and Poole were able to report that the Ford Foundation had been asked for $47,900 to make possible "a thorough, scholarly, and objective study of those areas of college and university administration involved with or closely related to internal and external public relations." ACPRA's proposal to the foundation indicated its intention to seek the participation of a group of college and university presidents, college and university public relations and development officers, professional public relations counselors and fund-raising counselors, professional management counselors, and leading businessmen and industrialists to serve as an advisory committee during a two-day conference to be held in the fall. Hopkins said that, to provide background for the conference, the committee would summarize the findings of two proposed surveys, one seeking the opinions and recommendations of all ACPRA members in regard to the specific problems outlined in the overall study, the other a survey of existing organizational patterns, titles, and administrative relationships in all colleges and universities represented by the ACPRA membership.

When the Association met in Omaha in June for its fortieth anniversary convention, Hopkins was able to announce that a Ford Foundation grant of $50,900 had been received, and that the American Alumni Council would be a joint sponsor of the two-day conference.[9] With the many details of an undertaking so large yet to be worked out, the conference was eventually scheduled for February 27-March 1, 1958, and thus could be considered one of the great achievements of the administration of James R. Jordan, president in 1957-58, as well as that of Lynn Poole's administration.

The agreement to sponsor jointly the two-day conference proposed by ACPRA's Survey Committee was only the first of several actions which drew ACPRA and the American Alumni Council, its next door neighbor in the ACE building, closer together in 1956-57. At the March meeting of ACPRA's Executive Committee, President Poole was authorized to name a committee "empowered to invite a committee of the Alumni Council to a joint meeting for the purpose of exploring means of increasing cooperation between the two organizations in order to strengthen the services of both to higher education as a whole."[10]

The report of ACPRA Secretary-Treasurer Howard Curtis presented at the Omaha convention indicated that this action had been carried out "to the mutual satisfaction of those attending from AAC and ACPRA." Emphasizing that there were "great possibilities for cooperation between the two groups," Curtis' report listed three things already determined: (1) that AAC would henceforth join with ACPRA and the Council for Financial Aid to Education in making the annual survey of voluntary support to higher education; (2) that the Executive Committees for both organizations would hold one of their 1957-58 meetings in the same city at the same time to facilitate exploration of possibilities for further cooperation; and (3) that tentative arrangements had been made to hold the 1960 conventions of both organizations in adjacent Washington hotels with members having the privilege of attending sessions of either organization as they wished.[11]

At its first meeting of 1956-57 in October, ACPRA's Executive Committee made half a dozen other decisions. One of these gave further support to work of the President's Committee for Education Beyond the High School, for which a committee of five ACPRA leaders had drawn recommendations for a comprehensive communications program the preceding June. Now arrangements were made for Herbert Heston, assistant to the president at Hood College, to represent ACPRA on the committee and to give two days a week to the committee as a public relations consultant.[12] In addition, the Executive Committee encouraged members to work with regional groups associated with this project which Congress had funded with an appropriation of $150,000 for the 1957 fiscal year. The committee, headed by Devereaux C. Josephs, chairman of the board of the New York Life Insurance Company, issued its first interim report in November. It emphasized that one of its main purposes was to "give the American people the salient facts about education beyond the high school and to show the need for planning timely action on local, state, and federal levels."[13]

In the next step, five regional committees would each hold a sectional conference. It was expected that these conferences along with studies made to determine the problems of students, the problems institutions faced in seeking adequate resources, and the concerns related to nonbaccalaureate education, would provide materials for a second report emphasizing the need for "an explicit, considered policy as to the role of the Federal Government in education beyond the high school."[14] ACPRA recommended that members work as public relations counselors for the five regions, and three such counselors were appointed for each region.[15]

Plans for the new publication which the Association had approved at the Greenbrier convention to take the place of the *College Public Relations Quarterly* and ACPRA *News Letter* were finalized at the October meeting of the Executive Committee. They called for a twenty-four-page magazine of 8½ × 11 format to be published ten times a year on a good grade of blue-white stock with liberal use of color, white space, photography and other forms of art work, and modern makeup. Paid advertising would be carried to help meet the cost of the publication. The magazine, according to plans presented by Editor Ben Morton, would have three functions: (1) to provide a forum for the interchange of ideas and techniques among members in the general areas of college and university public relations and development; (2) to compile for the membership the results of other thinking and research in those areas; and (3) to be of general service to higher education as a resource document in the areas of public relations and development.[16] At the October meeting, the resignation of James W. Armsey, vice president for publications and Association services, was received and William E. Keys, director of news information services at the University of Texas, was appointed as his successor. Armsey had announced his withdrawal from college public relations to become assistant to the president of the Ford Foundation.

As ACPRA began seeking financial aid from outside sources, it checked with the federal tax offices to determine its tax-exempt status. Poole reported at the Executive Committee's October meeting that the federal office had no records of tax exemption for the Association and that application for such exemption was being filed on October 10, with the Internal Revenue Service in Baltimore.[17] In June, 1957, the Association received notice that its petition had been denied and consideration of further plans for opening this important door to outside contributions was placed on the agenda for the Omaha convention.

The Association's Placement Service was taking more and more of the executive secretary's time. At the October meeting the Executive Committee voted to increase the registration fee from $2 to $3 and the placement fee from one to two percent of an individual's salary for his first year in a job secured through the Association. Despite the fee increase, 405 candidates registered for placement during 1956-57, compared to 144 the preceding year. The number of vacancies listed also increased, from ninety-two in 1956 to 138 in 1957.

Association officers had discovered that closing the fiscal year on July 15 had presented problems which might be avoided were the date changed to July 31. The October meeting authorized a mail referendum of the membership, and the fiscal year was changed to run from August 1 to July 31.[18] At the same time the committee gained the approval of the membership to change the title of the national office's top administrator from executive secretary to executive director.[19]

After enjoying rent-free privileges in its first national office site for six years, ACPRA now faced the obligation of paying $1,800 in office rent for 1956-57. Enlargement of the staff to four persons also increased the outgo for salaries by sixty-five percent, and additional services anticipated promised to increase the cost of almost every item in the budget. The Executive Committee nevertheless adopted in October a budget of

$45,000. With income for the year estimated at $28,000, the $45,000 figure called for an allocation of $17,000 from a surplus of approximately $30,000 the Association had accumulated since 1951. Ultimately, expenses for the year ran to $54,414. Income for the year also exceeded the original estimate by approximately $8,775, but it was finally necessary to dip into surplus for $17,534 to balance the books for the year.[20]

The final issue of ACPRA *News Letter*, which had been a regular publication of the Association since 1949, appeared in six pages under the date November-December. Of special interest to Association members was a report on the study of salaries for 1955-56 made by NEA. Highest salaries received by public relations officers among the 731 institutions participating in the survey ranged from $7,500 in nonpublic colleges with enrollment under 500, to $13,500 in state universities and land-grant colleges and to $15,000 in nonpublic universities. The highest median salary was $8,100 in municipal universities. Lowest salaries varied from $2,000 in nonpublic colleges under 500 to $5,845 in municipal universities.

The first extensive information concerning the up-coming campaign of the CFAE and the Advertising Council in behalf of higher education was also carried in this issue. ACPRA had been invited to present its suggestions and when a ten-man committee was named to serve as an advisory group for the Advertising Council Edward D. Eddy, Jr., vice president of the University of New Hampshire and an ACPRA member, was included. Stressing the importance of higher education to the national welfare and oriented toward the ultimate objective of helping colleges get more funds, the campaign was scheduled to start in April, 1957.

The new magazine of the Association, after nearly six months of planning, appeared in mid-January under the title *Pride*. The name, said Editor Morton, had been selected after much soul-searching and debate. *Pride* was chosen, he revealed, not merely because it was "short, snappy, and easy to remember" but, more important, because it was composed of the first letters of the words public relations, information, development, and editing.[21]

Although the magazine appeared only six times during the 1956-57 fiscal year it made a wide impression as a quality publication. After only eight months of residence in the capital, Editor Morton was elected to the presidency of the Washington Chapter of the Educational Press Association, an organization including the editors of more than 200 educational periodicals.[22]

Content of the magazine for the six months included, as promised, articles touching every facet of educational public relations. Among eight articles included in the first issue of *Pride* was one on "Public Relations in Fund Raising," by Bernard P. Taylor, executive secretary of the Penn State Foundation of the Pennsylvania State University, and since 1947 the director of workshops on public relations and fund raising.[23]

"The tools of public relations and the tools of development are inseparable," Taylor emphasized. "The procedure of presenting the case for an institution and the acts of soliciting or receiving gifts are in themselves fundamental public relations activities on a critical level. The harvest is the reward. It is inseparable from the farming. Good public relations are for a purpose—and that purpose in our case is the development of educational resources. Therefore, we must include in our conception of public relations activities that which will bring to fruition the seeds of good will, that which we have nurtured and cultivated with much effort and expense."

Empahsizing that the individual is important in fund raising, Taylor declared: "The individual makes the final decision for himself, perhaps with counsel from others such as lawyers, friends, or family; the foundation or trust fund through the trustees with the majority consent of the individual members; and the corporation by the consent of the directors or members of the executive committee. It is important to note that in each case the decision was made by one individual, several individuals, or a majority of individuals.

"The motivations of the individual, the organization which individuals represent, or sometimes the personal motivations of one or more of these representatives are the determining factors in making a grant or gift to your institution.

"By and large, one or two members of a board often influence the final decision. It is advantageous to know who these are. It becomes perfectly clear then that, in public relations for fund raising, we must deal with the motivations of the individual. . . .

"Who may be expected to give financial support to your institution?" Taylor asked in conclusion. "If you answer this question in a scrupulous and realistic fashion, you not only will have developed a trustworthy prospect list, but you will have projected a dependable guide for your public relations program. And at the same time you will have saved yourself time and money shuffling and pondering over the cards of unproductive wealthy individuals and foundations."

In addition to the articles, *Pride* brought members information about activities of the national office and about other activities interesting to persons engaged in college public relations work. In January, it announced that development workshops had been held in Buffalo and Milwaukee and others were being planned for Columbus, Cincinnati, and a yet-to-be designated location in Arkansas or Tennessee. In March, the readers learned that the Foundation Library Center, a repository of information about foundations, had been established at 588 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and already had files on more than 7,000 such organizations. In May, it informed readers that William Kirkwood, from 1922 to 1925 president of ACPRA (at that time known as the American Association of College News Bureaus), had died April 9 at the age of ninety. And in June it revealed through another Stewart Harral survey that ninety-two colleges and universities were now offering public relations courses. In 1946 only twenty-one had offered courses in the field.

The March issue included information on the progress of the national publicity campaign the Advertising Council and Council for Financial Aid to Education were kicking off in March. ACPRA and the American Alumni Council had now been designated by the community of educational associations "to act jointly in coordinating the local efforts as far as this is possible from a national standpoint." Association leaders in Chicago, St. Louis, and Cleveland were already planning regional conferences to help make the most of this campaign whose benefits would be felt throughout the 1960s and beyond.[24] In time and space devoted to it by the organizations and institutions involved, this campaign became a multimillion dollar project.

ACPRA had long been looking for a seal which would represent the organization with dignity on its publications and stationery. A design submitted by Richard Beasley, a senior at the Rhode Island School of Design, through Raymond Carmichael, the school's director of public relations, won the approval of the Executive Committee at its winter meeting in March.[25] The design, for which Beasley received $100, was used by the Association until 1970.

Much of the committee's time at the March meeting was devoted to a discussion of sections and sectional organization. Sports, Medical and Development Sections were already established, a Communications Section was soon to be organized, and assistants to presidents and religious groups gave indication that sectional organization would also be good for them. But concern was expressed that too much sectionalizing could become detrimental to the Association and its total program. "How do you divide people with several roles—specialist and generalist—into several sections?" was a question raised, according to minutes of the meeting. "The sections cause problems by duplicating the efforts of the national office," read another entry in the minutes. "Sections came into being because of special interests. Their work is not a thing apart although they have tended to isolate themselves. In conferences their programs are planned by the sections for the sections—as an appendage. ACPRA has gone the cycle. It has split several ways and now the time for regrouping has arrived." No decision was reached following the discussion, but, read the minutes, "It was felt that laying problems in the open was profitable and provided good foundation for the time when the Study Committee makes its recommendations."[26]

The Association, however, was soon to lose its Sports Section. Oldest of the three sections in existence, it was gradually growing weaker because many of its members had for nearly a decade been attending meetings of sports publicists held in conjunction with meetings of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Consequently, attendance of sports publicists at ACPRA conventions had dwindled and attention given to sports on these programs had decreased. Meanwhile, attendance of sports information directors at the separate convention of the Sports Section in Chicago had grown to more than seventy by 1956.[27]

Believing that few of them could afford to attend two conventions a year and that sports publicists were "not getting full value from the parent organization," Sports Section members asked that affiliation with ACPRA be open to all sports publicists for $7.50 annual dues whether or not their institutions held primary membership in the Association, that the dues be allocated half and half to the national organization and the Sports Section, and that the Association's national office handle publication and distribution of the Sports Section *News Letter* which had been published ten times a year since 1953. Because the proposal would have violated the ACPRA's bylaws and exceptions could not be made for one group and not for another, the proposal was denied.[28]

After more than 100 sports publicists turned out for the Chicago meeting of ACPRA's Sports Section in Chicago on August 6-8, 1957, the section organized under its own name, College Sports Information Directors of America (CoSIDA). A report adopted unanimously by the new organization urged all CoSIDA members to retain ACPRA membership and the new organization itself to apply to ACPRA for an affiliate membership.[29] When the sports publicity group during 1957-58 failed to meet the minimum activity requirements set by ACPRA's bylaws, the Board of Directors accepted a recommendation of the Executive Committee that the Sports Section be informed that it would be subject to abolishment unless it was revitalized to meet the activity requirement of the bylaws. Constitutionally, ACPRA could not offer a directorship to a representative of CoSIDA, but the board voted that a special effort be made to revitalize the Sports Section. At the same time it was emphasized that sports publicity would still have a place in ACPRA programs at district and national conventions.[30] When by July, 1959, no effort had been made by the sports publicists to help revitalize the Sports Section as such, it was dropped from the Association's organizational format. Approximately fifty sports information men continued to hold ACPRA membership and efforts were made for several years to give coverage to their special interests both in the Association magazine and on the programs of district conventions.

When 437 members of ACPRA assembled in Omaha on June 24 for the 1957 convention marking the Association's fortieth anniversary, they took only a passing glance at the past and launched into four days of intensive consideration—8 a.m. until midnight on most days—of the problems presently faced or anticipated in educational public relations.

Representatives with ROTC units on their campuses spent most of the first day in seminars, the theme for which was "The ROTC in Our Colleges—Its Relationship to Students, Faculty, and the Community." Meanwhile, those from Protestant colleges were busy discussing their public relations opportunities and problems in seminars sponsored by the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of Churches. The delegates then turned their attention to public relations as related to the areas of communications, development, medicine, and sports. Communications was covered in a general seminar, two clinics, and discussions touching every facet and recognized medium; development received microscopic attention in six sessions; medical public relations people took an equally close look at their work in five sessions; and sports men and women devoted their sessions to discussions of budgets and building better relations with sports reporters from press, radio, and television.

General sessions of the convention featured a report from four former ACPRA members "now discovering new horizons in other fields of public relations having application to educational public relatins," and a report on progress of the Survey Committee. Addresses were given by Conger Reynolds, director of the Office of Private Cooperation of the United States Information Agency; James M. Mitchell, associate director of the National Science Foundation; Dr. John H. Furbay, director of the educational and cultural program of TransWorld Airlines; Kenneth G. Patrick, manager of educational relations and corporate support service of the General Electric Company; Dan J. Forrestal, president of the Public Relations Society of America, and Edward L. Bernays, pioneer public relations counselor. On two afternoons, the delegates had opportunity for individual consultation with twenty-five experts in various areas of public relations during "Ask the Man who Knows" sessions. Especially for the benefit of members unable to attend the convention the Association later published a booklet, *Convention Reports*, giving in sixty-eight pages summaries of the convention's sessions and nonbusiness meetings. The roster of members, various statistics and business reports were published as usual in the *Membership Directory and Annual Reports*.

The convention was held without the presence of President Poole. Seven weeks earlier he had suffered the first of a series of heart attacks which eventually led to his death in 1969. In a message to the Board of Directors on the day before the convention opened, Poole—who had himself traveled an estimated 37,000 miles on ACPRA business since the preceding August—gave generous credit to his corps of officers including past President Ansley and President-elect Jordan. "Throughout this year," he said, "we have tried to make it one of increased service, penetrating self-study, and continued growth."[31]

In his report, Executive Director Johnston revealed that support had been given to the Sears, Roebuck Foundation in its production of a film on higher education, to President Eisenhower's People to People program, meant to initiate and expand person-to-person contacts with students and teachers outside the United States, to the sponsors of American Education Week, and to numerous special projects of sister educational associations.

With the cooperation of volunteers and officers of the sections, ACPRA had during the year, Johnston reported, produced a total of twenty-six new publications, many of them brochures of a promotional nature. In addition, twenty-four separate mailings of speeches, pamphlets, and reports had been processed so that over 60,000 pieces of mail had been handled during the year. In the executive director's opinion the office's informal information service, giving attention to nearly 500 requests for information, had been one of its most important services. The New Member Packet Service continued by A. Westley Rowland of Michigan State University, and the exchange of materials, mostly publications, sponsored by *Pride*, were other services accorded special recognition by the executive director.

One negative note in Johnston's report was his announcement that Ben Morton, editor of *Pride* and assistant executive director, had resigned to take a position at Inter-American University in Puerto Rico.

Further enlargement of the Association's services was suggested by the Executive Committee during the Omaha convention. It requested the executive director to take steps to establish a counseling service believed likely to be of special help for smaller colleges. The committee also voted that all membership promotion activities and record-keeping would be a part of national office responsibilities in the future.[32]

Formation of a Communications Section, as requested by petition at the Greenbrier in 1956 and formally authorized by the Association's Board of Directors on the day before the Omaha convention opened, became an accomplished fact when more than 100 members attended an organizational meeting on June 24. Lowell Treaster of Michigan State University, who had spearheaded a three-year drive to achieve approval for the new section, was elected as its first chairman.

The matter of tax exemption for the Association, denied by the Internal Revenue Service on May 31, was reviewed by the Board of Directors at the Omaha meeting. The Executive Committee was then authorized to explore two courses remaining open: appeal of the ruling to the general counsel of IRS, or formation of a foundation as suggested by Stewart Howe in 1954. The board also selected the sites for the Association's 1959 and 1960 conventions and authorized the executive director to investigate resort hotel possibilities for accommodating conventions in 1961 and thereafter. The convention would be held in French Lick, Indiana, in 1959 and in Washington the year following.

The project started in 1955-56 to replace the old numerical district designations with names had been completed, G. Duncan Wimpress, vice president for districts and membership, announced in his report. Eleven districts now remained and the new names of these, each followed by its former numerical designation, were: New England (I), Middle Atlantic (II), Mason-Dixon (IV), Southeastern (V), Great Lakes (VI), Mid-American (VIII), Mid-South (IX), Southwest (X), Rocky Mountain (XI and XIV), Far West (XII) and Pacific Northwest (XIII). Wimpress also reported that the *District Officers Manual* as submitted to the Board of Directors the year before had been distributed in mimeographed form, while awaiting the day it could be printed in loose-leaf format.[33]

ACPRA's coveted awards for distinguished service to higher education and for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education were conferred upon the Joint Council on Educational Television and Arthur L. Brandon, respectively, at the convention dinner. The council received its award "for its leadership in securing allocation of television channels for education; for its continuing efforts to protect these allocations; and for its cooperation with individual schools and colleges in the development of educational television facilities."

Brandon, now vice president for public relations at New York University and an elder statesman after nearly thirty years of leadership, was honored "for continuing leadership toward recognition of educational public relations as a profession; for unceasing effort in achieving greater prestige for public relations among other educational specialists; for his many achievements in educational public relations and administration for the distinguished universities he has served; and for his loyalty and devotion to this Association."[34]

At their business meeting, delegates named Howard S. Curtis of Brown University president-elect to serve in 1958-59 following James R. Jordan, University of Iowa. Other officers elected were: secretary-treasurer, George A. Pettit, University of California; vice presidents, A. C. Van Dusen, University of Pittsburgh, sections, reelected; Dyer Massey, Furman University, districts and membership; William G. Wilcox, Ohio State University, publications and Association services. The Board of Directors for 1957-58, in accordance with the bylaws, would include forty persons, largest number in the Association's history to date.[35]

Far from leveling off as many had expected, ACPRA's membership continued to climb in 1956-57 and by convention time had reached 1,547, up 159 over the year before. Underscoring the growing prestige of the Association in the national educational picture was the fact that the number of member institutions had now reached 860.[36] Moreover, the roster now included members from Alaska, Canada, Hawaii, Japan, Mexico, Panama, and Puerto Rico as well as all forty-eight states.

ACPRA, which had not had a dues increase since 1949, saw the need for more income to finance the expanding program. By a mail vote shortly after the Omaha convention, members approved a new dues structure suggested by the Board of Directors. This called for the dues of institutional and educational agency members to be raised to $35 from $25, those of individual active members and associate members to be increased to $10 from $7.50, and those of personal members to be increased to $35 from $25. Dues for business and student members would be continued at $50 and $5, respectively.[37]

It was action of this kind, recognizing that larger jobs remained to be done and the means for doing them must be provided, that led Lynn Poole to say in retrospect nearly a decade later: "The ACPRA of my presidency was nothing compared to the activities and challenges of today's organization. Perhaps that is the basic value of ACPRA—it continues to grow, expand and tackle the increasing problems of higher education; it never merely exists, it is in the vanguard."[38]

Search for Greater Effectiveness

The proposal which ACPRA's Study Committee submitted to the Ford Foundation early in 1957 had been of "considerable interest" to the foundation, according to the July announcement with which the committee indicated that a support grant of $50,900 was being made.

"We were especially interested because the ACPRA representatives assured us they were not thinking of just 'another study'," said James W. Armsey, former ACPRA leader who had recently become assistant to the president of the Ford Foundation. "They were seeking to uncover really promising ideas regarding the organization, relationships, determination of personal qualifications and means of effective educational service in this growing group of relatively new or recently formalized areas of college and university administration, including public relations, fund raising, alumni affairs, institutional development, radio and television, and community service of various kinds."[39]

By the time *Pride's* first issue for 1957-58 appeared, Everett Hopkins' committee, henceforth to be known in ACPRA history as the Study Committee, had held seven meetings and determined that the project would attack problems within four specific areas in the field of higher education administration and development:

"(1) *The college or university presidency*. To determine and evaluate means by which the physical and mental burden of the college presidency can be lightened by public relations and development administrators.

"(2) *Relationships between and among the various administrative areas concerned with public relations, fund raising, and institutional development*. To provide better insight into the functional and organizational relationships which exist between these and related administrative areas. . . .

"(3) *Qualifications of administrative personnel in areas of educational public relations, fund raising, and institutional development*. To develop accurate descriptions of the administrative and professional positions in these areas.

"(4) *The need for public confidence in higher education*. To provide practical suggestions for acquiring public confidence, and to analyze the effects which the institution's handling of the problems described in subjects 1, 2, and 3 have on this confidence."[40]

The committee, meeting for the first time back in the fall of 1956, had concluded that its study must be designed first of all to render the greatest possible service to *all* higher education, "regardless of the present structure of either ACPRA as an organization, or the present administrative structures existing on our various campuses." It had also decided that the study "should take the 'big look' at the entire area with no inclination whatever to prejudge or to influence the ultimate results."

The committee likewise determined in that first meeting that its study should help members of ACPRA to gain a better understanding (1) of their educational mission; (2) of sound principles of administration and organization; (3) of their general competence as public relations people; (4) of the role of philanthropy in society with specific reference to principles and techniques in the educational field; (5) of the great potential value—as well as some of the problems—of a closer relationship with private business and industry in their respective communities; and (6) of their potential roles on their respective campuses in matters of day-to-day as well as long-range policy determination.

The Hopkins committee had also in its first year of activity sent out a questionnaire to ACPRA members. The questions concerned the type of internal organizations which they regarded as most adequate and efficient and what ACPRA should do, or could do, to offer more and better services to higher education, to its institutional and individual members, and to the development of educational public relations as a profession. College and university presidents through another questionnaire were asked to indicate which type of internal organization for public relations and development now existed on their campuses and which type they regarded as ideal.

Dozens of suggestions for the improvement of ACPRA and for the committee's guidance were received and all of the former were passed along to the Association's Board of Directors for its consideration. Eight types of institutional organization were reported by the 221 institutional members and 385 presidents replying. Most institutions (about twenty-two percent) were functioning with an internal organization in which the public relations and alumni officers reported directly to the president himself. Few institutions—fewer than one percent,—however, regarded this organization as ideal.

The second most popular internal organization at that time was one in which there was, under the president, an administrative officer who coordinated work of the public relations, alumni, and fund-raising offices, each with its own administrator. Not quite twenty percent of the institutions were using this format, but the fact that nearly eighty-seven percent considered it to be the ideal indicated the likelihood of increased acceptance. The third type showed the president himself as the coordinating officer for the public relations, alumni, and fund-raising offices. Although about sixteen percent of the institutions were currently using this format, only nine percent regarded it as the ideal type of organization. In all of the other types of organization currently in use the president served as the coordinating officer for public relations, alumni, and fund-raising offices set up in a variety of ways, but only two of these received as much as one percent support as "the ideal type of organization."[41]

After the Ford Foundation grant gave assurance that a conference could be held as the climax of the Study Committee's work, ACPRA invited the American Alumni Council to become a partner in the project. The invitation was readily accepted and thereafter ACPRA's committee was joined by four members of AAC—Ernest T. Stewart, executive director of the Council; Howard W. Mort, executive director of the University of Chicago Alumni Association and the Council's president; Donald E. Smith, director of development at Washington and Lee University and the Council's president-elect; and Loren Hickerson, alumni director at the University of Iowa.[42]

After the Study Committee had planned every detail for the conference in a total of nine meetings—the last four with the Council's representatives participating—the long-anticipated conference was held at the Greebrier in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, on February 27-March 1, 1958, with "Higher Education—Its Advancement and Support" as its theme. A subtitle was "A Conference on Organizational Principles and Patterns of College and University Relations." Seventy persons, including thirteen college presidents representing every section of the country; professional public relations and fund-raising counselors, management consultants and leading industrialists, as well as thirty leaders drawn from the membership of ACPRA and AAC, participated.

To help prepare participants to make maximum contributions, ten advance mailings covering a variety of subjects had been sent out during the two months preceding the conference. Included were thought-provoking materials on such subjects as "What Is Public Relations?" "Alumni Programs—Why?" "The Destructive Financial Squeeze," "The Importance of Long-Range Planning," "The Organization and Management of Universities," and basic questions related to the four principal types to be discussed during the conference—public relations, alumni relations, financial support, and internal organization and management. Preceding the conference, ACPRA and AAC members who had been selected to serve as chairmen and recorders for the five general sessions and the five discussion groups to be held concurrently after each session, assembled at the Greenbrier for a day to assure complete understanding and orientation for the jobs assigned. The conference, meeting over a twelve-hour period on each of its first two days and for a three-hour session on the final day, was covered in full by stenotypists who accumulated more than 1,600 pages of material. This material was then turned over to William E. Porter, associate professor of journalism at the University of Iowa, who had been commissioned to write an impressionistic report. Published eight months later this volume of eighty-four pages became one of the most important contributions ACPRA made to its members in the 1950s.

The first report to members of ACPRA concerning the conference was prepared by President Jordan and President Mort of AAC for publication in the April, 1958, issue of *Pride*. Highly pleased with the cooperative effort which had produced the conference, they declared that "this planning partnership has been genuine and exceedingly fruitful. In this joint activity, we have come to realize even more than ever our common denominators of professional and institutional interest."[43] The remainder of their article was strictly reportorial in nature with some quotations from the addresses which preceded each session.

When ACPRA held its 1958 convention in San Francisco in July Hopkins made a detailed report that occupied six of the thirty-one pages devoted to the year's edition of *Annual Reports*. Hopkins told the convention delegates that the definitive report on the conference would have to await publication of Professor Porter's book, but indicated that the conferees had come to a sense of agreement on seven points:

> (1) That not only do the *functions* of public relations, alumni relations, and fund raising exist, in some form, on each of our campuses, but there are, with growing importance, essential objectives and essential ingredients of sound programs in each of these functional areas;
>
> (2) That each one of these major functions is an essential part of a broadly-conceived program of institutional advancement;
>
> (3) That the need for organizational and administrative coordination of these related functions is essential;
>
> (4) That, while there is no single 'best' organizational pattern for achieving this administrative coordination at the institutional level, yet in the administration of each college or university, regardless of size or type, there are common principles and practices of good organization and management that are equally applicable;
>
> (5) That the decision as to what *is* the most appropriate organizational pattern for any given institution is obviously a decision to be made by that institution;
>
> (6) That there was a clear recognition of the need for up-grading the qualifications of the personnel performing administrative duties in these areas;
>
> (7) That, while there was no agreement on any percentage formula for budgeting allocations for these institutional functions (since any one institution may have far greater need for intensified effort than other institutions) there was agreement on the need to *increase* proportionately the budgeting allocations for these activities.

Hopkins reported that there had been considerable discussion about titles during the conference—without agreement. No fewer than twenty-four different titles were held by the thirty ACPRA and AAC members who participated in the conference.

"It was agreed early in the Greenbrier proceedings," Hopkins said, "that finding an appropriate title which could come into general usage to describe this function would be a significant contribution to higher education. In this regard the conference failed. . . . It can be said, however, that there appeared to be general agreement that the chief coordinating officer in this broad area should serve as a chief deputy to the president in the same sense that the chief academic or educational officer, or the chief business officer serve in their respective areas."

Five steps were being planned, Hopkins reported, for a program of follow-up for both the general study and the Greenbrier Conference. These, he said, included publication of the conference report; regional one- or two-day workshops, primarily for college and university presidents, concentrating on the question of how to bring about the degree of coordination at the institutional level that the Greenbrier Conference held to be so vital; discussion of the same subject at regional ACPRA and AAC conventions during 1958-59; encouragement of professional educational associations to provide time for discussion of this subject during their annual conventions; and encouragement of professional journals to give space to articles and reviews related to the subjects discussed at the Greenbrier Conference.[44]

Although the Greenbrier Conference was regarded as ACPRA's greatest achievement of 1957-58, advancement was made on nearly all fronts during the year. The new magazine, *Pride*, appeared with the imprint of a new editor, George Doty, in September. The twenty-five-year-old Doty had come to ACPRA by way of Antioch College, the intern program at the University of Iowa, and the advertising firm of Brown & Bigelow. He continued to give the Association a publication which won recognition among professional journals while providing a balanced diet of articles helpful to the membership. Two new features were introduced. "Noted With *Pride*," sometimes running to four pages, chronicled the activities of individual members, while "For Immediate Release" kept members acquainted with the activities of the districts and sections as well as of the Association itself. By the time the tenth issue of *Pride* appeared in June, 1958, circulation of the magazine had gone beyond 2,000.[45]

Indicating the increasing interest in fund raising as a facet of public relations was the space devoted to it both in editorial and advertising material. The September issue of *Pride* included nearly six pages of advertising, approximately two-thirds of which was placed by professional fund-raising organizations. In some later issues the percentage of fund-raising advertising was even greater.

Eight of approximately sixty major articles published in *Pride* during the year dealt with fund raising. In writing on "The Future of Private Giving in the United States to 1975" Leslie Cookenboo, Jr., associate professor of economics at Rice Institute, gave encouragement to development officers. With the gross national product expected to grow approximately five percent a year, giving to private charitable institutions, Cookenboo predicted, would be twenty-eight percent above the 1955 level by 1960 and by 1970 would be double that level.[46]

The thought that Professor Cookenboo might have underestimated the increased potential for fund raising was suggested by announcement that giving to higher education had reached an all-time high in 1956-57. A study by the John Price Jones Company, reported in *Pride*, revealed that the fifty representative colleges and universities included had received gifts and bequests totaling $272,734,000, a gain of about thirty percent over the previous year's high of $204,274,000. Gifts represented $229,390,000 of the total, while bequests accounted for $43,344,000. Included in the total was the $52,775,500 which forty-two of the private colleges and universities surveyed had received from the Ford Foundation in accomplishment and faculty salary endowment grants.[47]

Just as encouraging were the data accumulated by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, ACPRA, and AAC in their survey of giving to colleges and universities published in April, 1958, under the title *Going Up . . . Voluntary Support of America's Colleges and Universities*. This survey revealed that the 904 cooperating institutions had received $832,937,123 in 1956-57, a dramatic increase of 150 percent since the first survey made two years earlier. Including the Ford Foundation grants for faculty salaries, gifts from general welfare foundations made up $319,085,152, or about forty percent of the total. When alumni giving in all areas—bequests, annuities, governing boards, etc.—was combined, it accounted for twelve percent of the total. Other major sources of gifts were religious denominations, 9.55 percent; corporations and business concerns, 9.41 percent, and bequests, 9.00 percent. Gifts from foundations increased a startling 535 percent over the earlier survey and those for basic research 135 percent.[48]

Among the thirty-six *Pride* articles dealing with the philosophy of educational public relations and the tasks of practitioners in the field, one called "The Evaluation of Public Relations Programs" stands out. Written by George A. Pettit, assistant to the president of the University of California, the article emphasized that the evaluation of a public relations program must start with "a realistic appraisal of the college or university and its conceivably possible goals."

"There is nothing more difficult than to attempt to show public relations progress for any organization until it frankly states where it is and sets its appropriate goals," Pettit wrote. "Sometimes such a frank appraisal is the best single public relations move that the organization could take. It hits the public with the same refreshing impact as a piece of modest and obviously honest commercial advertising. Psychologists tell us that one basic ingredient of a healthy and likeable personality is an ability to weigh one's own talents, recognize one's own limitations, and face the world with the expressed resolve to achieve through work, courage and dignity. . . .

"Public relations program evaluating which does not get beyond clipping counts, or other measures of the activity of people hired to do public relations, is in the long run meaningless unless it has accomplished at least a part of some predetermined result. Public relations evaluation has to speak in terms of educational purposes accomplished if it is to justify itself in an educational environment. It must start with a realistic appraisal of the service that an educational institution is rendering, with a recognition of weaknesses and strengths. It must have an objective clearly stated in terms of the service that the institution should be rendering. With these points established we can at least make general estimates of how we are doing. Are we getting an appropriate number of the kinds of students we should have? Do we have the library and the plant facilities necessary to take adequate care of them? Do we have enough competent teachers, adequately compensated, to do the job?

"The amount of progress we may expect is not solely determined by the amount of money that is being spent on promotion, or on the volume of material and activity involved. If the institution has built a reasonable amount of prestige for a job well done in some sector, however limited, and if students, their parents, alumni, and every member of the faculty and administrative staff feel some sense of dedication toward the future of the institution, it will get along. A high morale among those associated with the college or university is more important than anything else in moving ahead, but it is an intangible that is difficult to measure until it reflects itself in rather concrete and material things such as teachers, books, buildings, and adequate budgets.

"Public relations is an all-hands job," Pettit concluded. "If the professional public relations worker never wrote a word for consumption outside the family, but succeeded in having every staff member, student, parent, and alumnus talking about the college favorably, he would probably never be asked to evaluate his program because it would be clear to all what was happening."[49]

Another *Pride* article promising lasting benefits for ACPRA members wishing to evaluate themselves and their efforts was "If I Were a College Public Relations Man Again," written by James Armsey, who had served the Association both as secretary-treasurer and as vice president for publications and Association services before moving along to the Ford Foundation.

"If I were a college public relations man again I would try to excel," Armsey wrote. "A few of us seem to think it is somehow unseemly for a public relations man to shine on the campus. . . . This feeling of inferiority is as harmful as the opposite pole of brashness and self-serving. It is time to stop equating the anonymity of the college public relations man with insignificance and impotence. It is time he forgot about anonymity altogether and became recognized for what he is—one of the most important members of the team in any institution. . . .

"It is the public relations man's task to help shape and clarify the aims of his institution, to express them in a language everybody can understand, and to make them recognized and felt by everyone both on and off the campus who should be concerned. The function is not merely to create understanding but to generate conviction. . . . There can be no development, no progress, without a good many people who care—and care intelligently and deeply—about what your organization stands for, what it is doing, and what it plans to do. . . .

"I would concern myself with upgrading in a tangible way that most intangible of all things—my institution's reputation. For it is reputation that determines the kind of faculty and student body—and money—that a college gets. And conversely, it is the kind of faculty and student body—and money—that a college gets that determines its reputation. . . . Essentially, reputation is the reflected image of the institution's character. It is not something that can be manufactured by clever language; the truth has a way of showing through a meretricious gloss of words. Reputation has to be built from within; and every statement of the institution's worth or aspirations must be based on valid, demonstrable fact. . . .

"I would attempt to get the widest possible dissemination of information about solid educational and scholarly accomplishments of my institution. I'd let the educational frills my college might be indulging in at the moment delight the few who delight in such things, but I wouldn't inflict an account of them on a public already afflicted with, displeased by, and sick of a plethora of frills, educational and otherwise.

"I would try to explain the purpose of education, which I believe to be the development of the human intellect and not the development of Rose Bowl or Cotton Bowl contenders or expert fly-casters, handymen, or socially adjusted morons.

"I would make it my business to know my institution better than anyone else—its history, its traditions, and ideas; where it came from, where it is now, and, above all, where it is going and how it intends to get there. I would try to be under no illusions as to its relative merits and shortcomings, so that I could perform more effectively, since I'd be working on the basis of reality and not in the realm of fancy.

"I would consider what the hundreds and thousands of other public relations voices of my institution were saying. For example, . . . are disgruntled professors shooting holes in the public relations man's glowing pictures by *their* version, where a word is worth a hundred column inches—over the dinner table and in the conference rooms with their fellow-sufferers from other institutions? . . .

"I would look beyond my own gates. I would try to learn what's going on in all of higher education. The public's understanding and support are being solicited for *all* of higher education. Needling another institution is a good way to undermine the public's confidence in all education, including *your* brand. Conversely, knowing and advancing education in general is in the long run bound to pay off for each college and university.

"If I were a college public relations man again," Armsey concluded, "I would work for the constant upgrading of the public relations function not only in my own institution but elsewhere. I would believe in it and work for it, or I would get out of it."[50]

To provide a bit of humor in *Pride*, beginning with the November issue Doty ran a cartoon each month to illustrate the words "to coin a phrase." Author of these phrases and the illustrations was Richard D. Pinney, vice president in charge of public relations at Coe College in Iowa. "Engineering public consent," "Reaching out to our various publics," and "Now let's just break this problem down a little . . ." were among the phrases Pinney used with his drawings to amuse readers.

Two other new features met with favor among readers. The first was "Headquarters Highlights," in which Executive Director Johnston gave each month a warm and chatty accounting of affairs in the national office. The second, titled "Publications," listed briefly each month pertinent information on recently published books, pamphlets, reports, and articles which promised to be of interest and help to members. This revived a feature Louis Bell had run in the *News Letter* in 1949 and helped inspire the establishment of *Education Abstracts*, a monthly the Association started to publish in 1963 to give members a longer rundown on published materials related to their fields.

Activities in the national office were disrupted briefly in the late winter and early spring of 1958 when ACPRA's landlord, the American Association of University Professors, served notice that, because of a grant received for a special project, it would need the three rooms occupied by ACPRA. From February 1 till late in March the Association operated in two rooms of its old quarters, then moved into a four-room suite on the first floor, thanks to the interest and cooperation of Arthur Adams, president of the American Council on Education.[51]

After they had decided that San Francisco would be the site of the year's national convention, "The Golden Gate in '58" became the slogan of those laying plans for the meeting. Because it was anticipated that many families would combine the convention trip with a western vacation, plans were announced early for ways to enable them to hold down expenses. Unique among these was "Operation Hospitality," in which nearly fifty colleges in twenty-one states offered to make their facilities, usually both housing and meals, available at nominal rates.[52] Announcement was made that boat rides in San Francisco Bay and tours to such places as the zoo, aquarium, planetarium, Chinatown, Treasure Island, and Golden Gate Park would be arranged for children as well as spouses. Plans were also announced for an eight-day post-convention trip to Hawaii to cost just over $300, including plane fare.[53]

"Sharing Problems, Sharing Progress" was the theme for the convention, which was compressed into three days instead of four as in most previous years. In addition to general sessions featuring such leading figures as John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation, and the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S. J., president of St. Louis University, the program was devoted to a series of seven seminars on each of four subjects: general public relations activities, development, communications, and medical public relations. Although the convention ended officially with the banquet on Wednesday night, development officers stayed on another day for two additional sessions. A special convocation sponsored by the Commission on Higher Education of the National Council of Churches for public relations and development officers of church-related colleges and universities also met for seven hours on the day after the ACPRA convention.[54]

Reports presented at the convention emphasized the growth and progress the Association had made in 1957-58. Although a referendum of members early in the fall had authorized an increase in dues—the first since 1949—membership had grown to 1,639, more than twice the number on the roster a decade earlier. The membership represented 921 institutions, an increase of forty-five over the previous year.[55]

However, a bylaws amendment passed in December, 1957, had authorized the elimination of personal and business memberships in the Association. The Executive Committee at its March meeting decided that honorary status in the Association should be moved out of the membership category into the awards category, with recipients being designated as honorary advisers to ACPRA. As a result of these actions, membership totals reported later in 1957-58 were somewhat different than those shown above. The later figures listed individual and educational agency totals at 1,564 for 872 institutions and forty-nine organizations.[56]

One area of progress of special interest related to cooperative efforts with the American Alumni Council. Largest of these efforts were the Greenbrier Conference and the Survey of Voluntary Support for Higher Education, in cooperation with the Council for Financial Aid to Education. This survey, now firmly established as one of the major services to higher education, would henceforth be eagerly anticipated not only by those college and university officers vitally concerned with institutional finance but also by alumni, foundations, donors, and others interested in the health and progress of the nation's educational institutions.

AAC and ACPRA had also cooperated with the Advertising Council's campaign in support of higher education, on district meetings, and on plans for national conventions to be held concurrently in 1960. "Our mutual attitude has been one of honest competition, friendly cooperation, and exploration of possibilities without pre-judgment," Executive Director Johnston said in his report to the convention. Because of overlap in the interests, duties, and activities of many members of the two organizations—347 members of ACPRA also belonged to AAC—the time now seemed appropriate for a detailed study of advantages and disadvantages involved in possible affiliation or merging of the two organizations. The Executive Committee had already authorized Johnston to make inquiries into a survey by an impartial, professional management consultant.[57]

The Association Placement Service, Johnston reported, had been more active than in any past year. More than 150 openings had been listed and 350 applicants registered. In addition, it had inspired a conference at which major educational groups had begun consideration of possibilities for a placement service for all higher education.[58]

Once again, the national office was trying to acquire tax-exempt status for the Association. Although the Association had twice gotten authority from the membership to make minor changes in the bylaws demanded by the Internal Revenue Service, progress was reported by Johnston as "painfully slow."

"Several times," he said, "it has appeared that a favorable ruling was about to be granted, but each time a new problem appeared. Since this is almost entirely a matter of administrative judgment rather than law, our dealings with the IRS have been of the most painstaking kind. Seemingly, we are now in about the same position we were in two years ago despite our efforts. Actually, we are much closer to a final decision."[59]

Because organization of a separate foundation as urged earlier by Stewart Howe seemed to be the only way the Association could achieve tax-exempt status, the Executive Committee decided to look into the possibilities for such action.

In his report to the convention, President Jordan was somewhat more optimistic than Johnston. "The prospect at this time is good," he said, "and the achievement portends a significant change in ACPRA's financing and, therefore, its ability to provide greater service with a dues framework within the reach of all institutions and representatives." One reason for the optimism was the fact that the American Alumni Council, whose purposes and program so closely paralled those of ACPRA, had recently been recognized as a tax-exempt organization for the purpose of soliciting grants and gifts in support of its activities.[60]

All of ACPRA's eleven districts held meetings in 1957-58, all now had their own bylaws, and all but one of them had their own newsletters. The recent trend toward division of the membership into special interest sections continued to such an extent in 1957-58 that some members feared that the movement might prove to be detrimental. However, the Development and Medical Sections proved their value with extensive programs. The former was especially active with three workshops, publication of nine newletters and a series of pamphlets, and compilation of a development bibliography. Consequently, the Board of Directors gave official approval to the Communications Section, organized the previous year and now operating under its own bylaws. The Board of Directors at San Francisco accepted the recommendation of the Executive Committee that the Sports Section be put on notice that it would be abolished in 1959 unless it met the activity requirements set down in ACPRA bylaws. Still, it authorized at the same time the appointment of a committee which would seek to revitalize the section. The directors also received a petition requesting establishment of an Administrative Section to give special attention to the problems of members in executive positions with multiple responsibilities for public relations, alumni activities, and development. The petition bore the twenty-five signatures demanded by the bylaws and the directors, after approving the request in principle, referred it to the Executive Committee for final action.[61]

Because the number of institutions appealing to ACPRA for guidance in setting up or improving their public relations and development programs was increasing, the Executive Committee early in the 1957-58 year authorized President Jordan to appoint an advisory committee for a proposed Consulting Service. At the same time it asked that the service be established with great care, both with regard to the building of a panel of consultants and to its operating policies.[62] A committee of four headed by William Wilcox, vice president for publications and Association services, worked throughout the year to determine guidelines. At the convention he presented a plan built on lists of available consultants in each of the Association's eleven districts. The lists, classified by fields of competence, would not be made public but would be used to provide a choice of consultants for any institution desiring help. Fees would be set by the Association on a per diem basis and expense allowances would be left to negotiation between the consultant and the institution. There was a possibility for cooperative action with other educational associations which were also trying to develop consulting panels, so the Board of Directors decided in San Francisco that no final decision should be made at that time and authorized further intensive consideration of a consulting service.[63]

Despite the continuing delay, the directors were confident that the Internal Revenue Service would ultimately decide favorably on ACPRA's request for tax-exempt status, thus opening the way for the Association to seek greater support for special projects. At their San Francisco meeting they consequently approved the idea of developing plans for projects and research and of outlining programs in order of importance and urgency.[64] This decision started the Association on the way to a greatly enlarged program in the years after 1960 when the IRS approval was finally received.

As the 1957-58 year got under way, the Executive Committee faced the necessity of dipping into reserves for the second straight year. In August, expenses for the year were projected at $51,150, about $2,500 of which covered bills being carried over from the year before. Estimated income would be only $47,300, even after the recent increase in dues. By convention time it was apparent that income for the year would not exceed $45,100 while expenses, largely because the cost of publications had jumped more than $4,600, would run above $56,000.[65] As a result, the reserve fund was reduced to $7,413 and the Board of Directors authorized a referendum of the membership seeking approval to increase institutional and educational agency dues to $50 from the $35 authorized a year earlier. Dues for student representatives and for additional representatives of institutions and educational agencies would remain unchanged.[66] As indicated earlier, two categories of membership, personal and business, had been eliminated through bylaw changes in December, 1957. The fee increase, expected to yield an additional $10,000 to $12,000 annually and put the Association on a sound financial footing, was approved by the membership in September, 1958, and the bylaws were amended accordingly.[67]

ACPRA conferred five awards at the San Francisco convention, two for distinguished service to higher education to the Advertising Council and the Council for Financial Aid to Education "for their advancement of the cause of higher education through an imaginative national advertising campaign which dramatized for America the problem facing colleges and universities," and to Devereux C. Joseph, president of the Carnegie Corportation and chairman of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. Two for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education were presented to Bradford D. Ansley, ACPRA president in 1955-56, and to Everett H. Hopkins, chairman of the Association's hard-working Study Committee. James W. Armsey, formerly of ACPRA and now with the Ford Foundation, was awarded the new status of honorary adviser.

ACPRA's first two presidents, T. T. Frankenberg and Bristow Adams, had died during the year, the former on July 26, 1958, at the age of eighty-one, the latter on November 19, 1957, at the age of eighty-two. The convention delegates honored them with resolutions paying tribute to their services.[68]

At their business meeting the delegates also approved the proposed slate of officers calling for Howard S. Curtis of Brown University to advance to the presidency and for Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., of Washington University in St. Louis to become president-elect. Osborn was the son of M. G. Osborn, who had served as vice president of AACNB during three of its early years.

Other officers elected at San Francisco were: secretary-treasurer, T. W. Van Arsdale, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; vice presidents, W. Robert Brossman, Colorado College, districts and membership; Arthur J. Schaefer, DePaul University, publications and Association services; and Lyle M. Nelson, University of Michigan, sections.[69]

ACPRA's president during the year of the Greenbrier Conference and the Golden Gate Convention was James R. Jordan, director of university relations at his alma mater, the University of Iowa. As a member of both the Iowa and American Bar Association, Jordan was one of only a few ACPRA members with a background in the law. His legal knowledge proved of great value to the Association as it wrestled with legal matters such as those related to the effort to gain tax-exempt status.

To those with whom he worked Jordan was the ideal public relations man—farsighted, deliberative, indefatigable, and possessed of a keen sense of humor. After listening attentively to the opinions of others, he was wont, like "the wise old counselor" one of his staff members admiringly called him, "to explain, demonstrate, and philosophize over why a particular course of action might (or might not) be advisable to follow." Moreover, he had a passion for detail and "always made sure that his staff understood his concern that major efforts not be undone by little details gone wrong." Far more than most of his colleagues, it seemed, Jordan had the quality of farsightedness, a fact which made him especially valuable not only to his university but to ACPRA and to other organizations and causes for which he worked. "I never knew him to decide on a given institutional posture," a colleague remarked, "without the most painstaking consideration of possible future developments which might affect the validity of the posture or require its alteration."[70]

Like most of his predecessors of recent years, Jordan gave much of his time during his administration to Association affairs, particularly district meetings. At each meeting he spoke on "The People vs. Educational Public Relations in the Court of Public Opinion, 1965." In early October, 1957, Russia had startled the world by launching the first man-made satellite, Sputnik I, and a month later had launched Sputnik II carrying a live dog, Laika, as the world's first space passenger. Before the end of January 1958, the United States launched Explorer I as its first earth satellite to go into orbit. Speaking in the lowering shadows of the Sputniks, Jordan hammered away on the thesis that the challenge confronting American higher education at that time was both the most threatening and most exciting in its history.

"Higher education," he told his audiences, "must quickly bring to public consciousness the true nature of education and the educational process, stripped of frill and fancy, if higher education is to obtain the understanding and support of the many, many more millions of Americans who must be brought to a belief in their absolute dependence upon higher education. . . .

"There is little doubt," Jordan continued, "that the revelations of the advances in Soviet science and education by the dramatic launchings has placed a new focus for the United States upon its educational system. But, unfortunately, the focus has been brought about by fear, and fear is dangerous in education. It distorts, it looks to short-term goals, it loses perspective."

Jordan asked his audiences to accept four ideas: "(1) that higher education in the United States is confronted with a mountainous challenge, perhaps even beyond our comprehension; (2) that the future of this society depends upon the quality and quantity of higher education the instrumentalities for higher education will supply;

(3) that greatly increased and broadened public understanding and support for the function as well as the instrumentalities of higher education are essential to meet this challenge; and (4) that all the healthy aspects of institutional and intellectual diversity and individuality within our institutions and among the individual members of the society must be preserved and strengthened."

Jordan was greatly disturbed by "the highly inflammable and questionable direct charges and vague, uninterpreted and suggestive label words being bruited about and which constitute serious threats to the solidarity of the total system of higher education." Likewise he was disturbed by "the impenetrable fog which has been created through the representations about and use of scholarships" which he declared had become "handouts, bribes, recruiting devices, discounts on our educational product and leeches upon institutional endowment."

"The important point for us at the moment," he asserted, "is that at a time when we need total public understanding for higher education in the United States, we are, instead, creating a divisive confusion in the minds of the people and creating it largely by playing upon public ignorance of what higher education is and how it is accomplished."

Regretfully, in Jordan's opinion, some members of ACPRA were guilty of contributing to the divisiveness—and the stature of the public relations officer would ultimately suffer unless the situation was remedied.

"This is the time for planning, thinking, daring in higher education and in public relations for higher education. Our particular job is to bring along on a rapidly accelerating ride a public which hardly has more than a hand on the tail-gate, to say nothing of a front seat in the wagon—or more appropriately, a hand on the tail-fin, to say nothing of a front seat in the rocket.

"The task," he concluded, "is so formidable, and the time is very short. . . . However, I believe, that with our best efforts, on a solid front, we can win the case of 'The People vs. Educational Public Relations in the Court of Public Opinion, 1965'."[71]

As the San Francisco convention came to a close and Jordan turned the gavel over to his successor he once more emphasized his conviction that "educational public relations are at the core of both the problem and the solution of the fundamental questions which American higher education faces today." At the same time he stressed the challenge to unity of action by ACPRA in behalf of all higher education.[72]

"All of us," he said, "may take rightful pride in the advance of ACPRA, but tighten the sweat band on your halos, my friends. A part of this is of our doing; the remainder may well be the accident of time and circumstance in the evolution of higher education as a function in this democratic society. The final determiner of our right to pride and credit will be the nature and effectiveness of our continued response to the need of all higher education for greatly enhanced understanding and support. As we improve our individual professional competence in the service of our institutions, and as ACPRA improves its service to its institutional members and to all higher education, we will meet the challenge and fulfill the obligation now placed squarely upon our shoulders. Should we fail or falter, higher education may not fall, but even to break stride may be to lose the race in which survival is the winner's prize and extinction the loser's lot."[73]

Challenges To Statesmanship

The October publication of *The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education*, the printed report on the Greenbrier Conference of February 27-March 1, brought to a climax more than two years of intensive work by ACPRA's Study Committee. Into the hands of presidents and Association members was placed a volume which would influence the future of ACPRA far beyond the observance of its fiftieth anniversary in 1967.

Ten thousand copies of the eighty-four-page book, written by William E. Porter of the journalism faculty at the University of

Iowa, were distributed to college presidents, members of the ACPRA and the American Alumni Council, and special lists of interested groups and individuals. Reaction immediately indicated that the publication had shed light on key problems faced by colleges and universities and could be regarded as one of the most significant contributions ACPRA had made in its forty-one years of service to higher education.[74]

In a foreword, Everett H. Hopkins, chairman of the joint ACPRA-AAC Study Committee, reemphasized that ACPRA's initiation of the study in 1956 had been prompted by its conviction that "(1) the very survival of western civilization . . . may depend on the strength and quality of American higher education; (2) what happens to the strength and quality of American higher education depends, in no small measure, on the degree to which the public really understands and is willing to support our colleges and universities; and (3) the advancement of such public understanding and support will depend almost exclusively on improving the effectiveness of individual institutional programs which are designed and carried out to achieve these ends." Out of the study and the conference, made possible by the Ford Foundation's $50,900 grant to ACPRA, it was hoped that guideposts, patterns of organization, and principles and objectives needed to guide colleges and universities in their programs of institutional development had emerged.[75]

Extracting the meat from 1,600 pages of stenotype notes accumulated during the conference, Porter devoted his book largely to four sections dealing with the internal organization of colleges and universities, their public relations, their alumni relations, and their financial support. A three-page conclusion and appendixes covering the conference's keynote address, listing the conferees, summarizing results of ACPRA's questionnaire studies made in 1956-57, and presenting significant quotations relating to public relations, alumni relations, and fund raising completed the book.

Porter emphasized at once in his book that the most important result of the conference and the studies preceding it had been the convincing revelation that "in most American institutions of higher education there is a clear need for administrative coordination of the functions of public relations, alumni relations, and the solicitation of financial support. . . . The number of people involved," he wrote, "is not essential to the concept of a unified program; the fact of coordination and the recognition of this new area of administration as an entity *is* essential and applies to institutions of all sizes."

Although he held that the term was not "very promising," Porter chose to use "coordinating officer" throughout the book to designate the person with general oversight of the three functions under discussion "because as it is used here, in this special context, its meaning is clear." Other titles suggested were generally avoided because of "obvious difficulties attached to each."

"The chief limitation of 'development,' " he explained, "is that, in many minds, it is associated exclusively with fund raising. 'Assistant to the President' indicates nothing of administrative responsibility; it is a contradiction in terms because it gives a 'staff' title to a 'line' officer. 'Secretary' generally has had a primary association with record-keeping. 'Advancement' may imply to some that all of the elements of the college not under the supervision of this functionary are not advancing. 'University Relations' is vague."

As an individual who would be a right arm of his overburdened president, the coordinating officer, the Greenbrier Conference had determined, could do three specific things: "(1) organize and direct a team of nonacademic specialists in such a way that they communicate and work together efficiently; (2) summarize and report upon the work of this team to the institution's president and report back to them in detail from the president's office; and (3) serve as a member of the president's immediate staff in policy making and planning."

Although the conferees had agreed that public relations, alumni relations, and fund raising should be the areas of primary responsibility for the coordinating officer, they also believed, Porter reported, that several other areas belonged logically under this administrator. These included planning and institutional growth, high school relations and student recruitment (but not admissions), industrial liaison, continuing institutional self-study, legislative relations (for tax-supported institutions), and church relations (for denominational institutions).[76]

In summary, the Greenbrier assembly had expressed belief that the man likely to be most competent for the post of coordinating officer would be one who "has a real commitment to education and to his institution, a thorough knowledge of the institution, a grasp of the techniques of his profession . . . confidence in himself, and self respect." "It is necessary," Porter wrote, "not only that he think of himself as an educator, but that the executives above him see him as something more than a technician with narrow, mechanical assignments or, as the Greenbrier keynote speaker put it, as something more than a professional soldier."

The Greenbrier conferees had agreed that a public relations program should have four objectives: "(1) to assist in establishing the institution's proper image in the public mind, and increasing public awareness of the image; (2) to help the institution to earn understanding, support, and sympathy; (3) to improve communication within the institution, and between the institution and the community it serves; and (4) to assist in developing good students, a strong teaching staff, and high academic standards."

At the same time they had agreed that the phrase "the image of the institution" might be misleading, that it might imply that the public relations man's job was to build a shining fiction. Emphasizing that such was not their intent, they declared that the primary skills of the public relations man must be those of assistance, not manipulation. It was also agreed that effective communication must be a two-way process.

"The public relations practitioner's ability to read and listen carefully—and ask the right questions—is essential equipment," Porter wrote, "and his steady reporting to the college administration of what he considers the climate of opinion and the nature of pubic response is one of his clear responsibilities.

"To assist in developing *good students, a strong academic staff,* and *high intellectual standards*: these are the ultimate objectives, or course, not only of any institution's public relations program but of all its operations," Porter continued. "It is for these things that a favorable image is created; understanding, support, and sympathy solicited; good communications networks established.

"It is also important to emphasize the word *developing*. Public relations sometimes becomes preoccupied with the status quo. But intelligent planning and constant growth depend, among other things, upon the effectiveness of the public relations man in assessing the impact of growth and change, and upon the contribution he can make to steering it wisely. If he is occupied only with the image of the institution as it stands, he may well sell his institution and himself short."[77]

"What conditions are necessary for the practice of effective public relations?" was one of the questions asked participants in the Greenbrier meeting. The consensus was that the first condition is a clear statement of the institution's own *educational* objectives. Other major essentials, the conferees agreed, are a sound product, an adequate budget (in most cases larger than currently available), and a staff composed of well-qualified individuals.

"The public relations officer is something like a hydraulics engineer," Porter concluded. "He can analyze and make clear to others the source of the current; he can help control and direct the flow and, given the proper equipment, even affect the color, purity, and pressure. But he cannot make rivers flow where there is no water, nor turn off a flood with the pressure of his thumb."

The Greenbrier Conference, as reported by Porter, determined that an organized program of alumni activity should do five things: "(1) encourage the alumni to maintain a continuing relationship with the institution; (2) enlist the alumni in constructive endeavor for the institution; (3) bring to bear on the institution and its policies the judgment and view of the alumni; (4) help the institution find ways for the encouragement of continuing education among the alumni; and (5) help create and develop among alumni a sense of responsibility not only to their institution but to higher education in general."

Although the conferees agreed that the idea of giving of money was probably foremost when administrators thought of enlisting alumni in "constructive endeavor" for their alma maters, they believed that many other actions and activities were possible to make former students a source of strength. The counsel of alumni received special emphasis.

"The administrator who shuts himself off from the counsel of his college's graduates . . . is depriving himself of essential help," Porter's report asserted. "By virtue of the fact that they are concerned enough to be organized, members of the alumni association are sensitive to public opinion about their institution; they not only have opinions of their own, but they are aware of what others think. An alumni officer who knows how to listen can get a great many answers to the question 'How's the old school doing?' simply through conversation."[78]

Ten conditions which "seem generally necessary" for a good program of alumni activity were determined at the Greenbrier. Listed first, ahead of an adequate budget and competent staff, was "mutual acceptance by the college and the alumni of their unique partnership in the educational enterprise"—the realization that alumni are not 'just another public, nor the college just another charity, palm-upturned'.

Other conditions held essential were: "(1) an adequate system of records, including the means of identifying alumni leadership; (2) effective channels of communication—two-way communication through direct contact, as well as printed media; (3) a student cultivation program, beginning in the freshman year, which will build the attitudes of interest that make a good alumnus; (4) programs carefully designed to utilize alumni potential on one hand and to serve alumni on the other; (5) headquarters and facilities in keeping with the job to be done; (6) effective liaison with the total college program; (7) effective liaison with the offices of public relations and fund raising."[79]

In writing his chapter called "The College and Its Financial Support," Porter avoided the use of the title "development officer," which had come into frequent use among colleges and universities.

"The fund-raising office is not often called by its accurate title," he explained. "The most common disguise involves the word 'development', and over a period of twenty-five years this has become a source of considerable confusion. In the beginning, the word was deliberately chosen as a euphemism by professional money-raising agencies who provide services to educational institutions. To them, and to many other people in higher education, 'development' simply is synonymous with 'fund-raising'."

"Both the primary objective and the chief means of evaluation [of the fund-raising office]," Porter reported, "can be stated in a single phrase: the raising of money. There may indeed be subsidiary objectives and means of evaluation (for example, a well-run fund-raising campaign can do much to help build a favorable public image of the institution; and the number of givers may be almost as important, in terms of a long-range program, as the dollar take), but these are also the objectives and measurement methods of public relations and alumni relations. The unique characteristics of the fund-raising enterprise rest in what have been described here (below) as the 'necessary conditions', and, particularly, the organizational pattern, the specific element of the program."

The prime condition for successful fund raising, the Greenbrier conferees had decided, was an effective public relations and alumni relations program. "No fund-raising program," Porter wrote "can assume the responsibility of converting the hostile and stimulating the indifferent as a basic obligation, although it may help to do both things incidentally. Essentially, generous financial support flows from an atmosphere of interested good will, confidence in the institution, and an honest sense of obligation. These are not qualities which can be turned on and off; they represent long-time building. If they are lacking, no amount of professional ingenuity can produce results." Willingness to cooperate and willingness of many people to work hard were also listed as necessary conditions, and most important among these people were the president, the trustees or regents, the faculty, the students, and the alumni. Other "necessary conditions" enumerated were: a well-defined case which deals chiefly in *reasons*; a competent fund-raising staff; a careful canvass of potential sources; proper timing and a practical timetable; and coordination with similar efforts on and off campus."

As they gave attention to the organization for fund-raising activities, the Greenbrier conferees came to four conclusions. "(1) The organizational pattern must provide easy communication with the areas of public relations and alumni activity, including access to alumni records and to information on current students; (2) there must be a source of authority to make final decisions when questions of jurisdiction arise; (3) the fund raiser should, in most cases, have status equal with that of the public relations officer and the alumni executive; (4) the necessity for a reasonably well-defined organization and designation of authority does not mean that a heavy-handed authoritarianism is required." Generally, the conferees seemed to feel that "fund raising does not have to be a policy job but that the fund raiser should sit in on policy meetings and be kept informed of policy at all times."

In concluding the chapter on "The College and Its Financial Support," Porter summarized the qualities, motivations, and interests of the ideal fund raiser as described at the conference. "The fund raiser should find zest and satisfaction in his work. He should also find both humility and dignity in it. His satisfaction grows not only from a comfortably mounting column of figures; it comes also from giving others satisfaction. The support of higher education has been found a most rewarding activity by many men and women; it is a critical function in our society. The people in the fund-raising program of the college or university must not only convince others of this. They must believe it themselves."[80]

Porter summarized the concerns of the Greenbrier Conference thus: "In the future, higher education must have public support on an unprecedented scale. If our . . . students are to be better trained, if our science is to conquer the new world of space and make our old world a better place in which to live, the American people must invest not only their money but their very souls in the complex, diverse American enterprise of higher education. Most educators are confident that the American people will, indeed, do this; they could not continue in their work if they believed otherwise.

"But if higher education is to deserve that support, it must provide contributions of its own. One of those contributions is efficient management and the ability to make the most of new opportunities. To grow in the ways which the times demand, higher education must have its house in order. It is the hope of this Study Committee that these studies will provide some help toward that end."[81]

The Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president of St. Louis University, gave the keynote address at the Greenbrier Conference and it was recieved so well that he gave it again at ACPRA's 1958 convention in San Francisco. It was then published as an appendix in *The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education*.

"One of our most fundamental tasks," Father Reinert told his audiences, "is to explode within our own academic walls what I like to call the 'professional soldier' theory of development and public relations. According to this theory, if your college decides it needs money or wants 'to improve its public relations', you go out and find an expert and add him to your full-time staff, or you retain professional counsel, or both. Then the rest of the institution sits back and waits for results . . . but there are large numbers of faculty and academic administrators who do not comprehend the essence of the development-public relations function. As I see it, your work is not a process of doing something in place of them so that the faculty and academic administration can argue that the 'professional' is doing the development-public relations job *for* them. . . . The only method by which we can explode the 'professional soldier' theory is to convince the individual college teacher that *he* is the key development-public relations person. Your function is that of 'bringing together', not of substituting for the faculty in its relationship to the public. . . . The key problem in trying to achieve this objective is dispelling from the minds of the academicians the false assumption that the 'professional PR soldiers' are solely responsible for the job. The first problem is this: How do you convince the faculty that you do not do the public relations-development job, but that the best you can do is help them get the job done?

"There is a second serious problem to be faced, a second theory to be exploded. . . . Not only must the professors and deans be aware of their direct role in public relations and development, but we must also bring everyone to the realization that the key to understanding on the part of our publics is *involvement*, not merely the over-simplified notion of communications. Lay appreciation of the educational process will never be achieved without involving them in the process. . . .

"In promoting such participation, your role as a public relations-development officer is again a unique and difficult one. . . . Your job is not self-contained; the effectiveness of your accomplishment lies outside yourself—getting the internal faculty and academic administrators involved in continuing participation with the external publics with a view of establishing mutual understanding."

The qualifications a public relations-development officer must possess, Father Reinert declared, are: "(1) the professional techniques which can give us the services we need—writing and communications skills, organizational abilities, knowledge of the community; (2) a deep, genuine understanding of the educational process [and] . . . its ultimate purposes; (3) [complete knowledge] of the special problems of your own institution; (4) willingness to be admitted to membership in the educational family on the basis of merit, not by reason of title or by executive legislation; (5) obvious dedication to the job of serving the university and its people; (6) unbounded patience and humility."

"Finally," said Father Reinert, "as a public relations or development officer in a college or university, . . . you are essentially a unique kind of salesman for higher education . . . . [And] you must be a salesman or saleswoman of professional integrity. You are selling a genuine quality product, one of the most valuable possessions in the world—human wisdom. Yours must be the same dedication, the same spiritual motivation as that of Mark Hopkins and all great teachers. And this moral integrity is not something you can put on outside your real self like an academic cap and gown. No, it must be a part of your very inner being. The financial support, the future students, the public understanding you are seeking for your institution—all of these and much else will be forthcoming only if it is obvious that you are motivated by the conviction that nurturing within yourself the precious possession of human wisdom and moral integrity, you are driven on with a fierce desire to share this pearl of great price with others. Only this sincerely genuine motivation will keep you on the job, determined to establish that continuing colloquium, that never-ending conversation between Mark Hopkins and his publics, determined to modernize Mark Hopkins without changing one whit the essential characteristics of the learning process, determined through your public relations and development offices thus to preserve by means of a strong higher educational system the wisdom and the values without which our best American traditions cannot be handed on to the generations who will come after us."[82]

As early as 1935, when President Frank Pellegrin approached the American Alumni Council advocating joint district meetings and consideration of possibilities for joint national conventions, ACPRA had seen the values of closer ties with the alumni organization. And since 1945 when ACPRA's first Plans and Policies Committee had recommended that the Association "work toward closer cooperation with the American Alumni Council,"[83] officers of the Association had been striving to implement that recommendation in every way possible.

Long strides had been made; however, the reactions received by the Hopkins committee and the questions raised during the Greenbrier Conference, emphasized more than ever the feeling that ACPRA and AAC must explore possibilities for greater cooperation. Both organizations, it was pointed out, had Development Sections whose programs resulted in considerable duplication of effort with resultant loss of time and money. Morever, about 400 individuals held membership in both ACPRA and AAC.

ACPRA President Howard Curtis took these facts as a mandate for action and no Association president ever worked harder at achieving a goal. Now forty-four years old, Curtis could look back on two decades of public relations work, starting with a year as assistant to Eleanor Mosely at Boston University. Before World War II, during which he spent four years in the European and Pacific Theaters as a Navy communications officer, he had been assistant to the president at Green Mountain Junior College in Vermont. Since the war he had been at Brown, serving successively as director of the news bureau, director of public relations, and secretary of the university.

Curtis, who ranked with Joe Wright of Illinois as the best of ACPRA's raconteurs, took little time during his presidency to maintain that reputation. Rather, he plunged with unflagging zeal into activities aimed at achieving closer ties and possible federation, if not merger, with AAC. He also devoted more time than any previous president to efforts aimed at bringing to the Association additional money from foundations and conferences.

Members of AAC's Executive Committee accepted an invitation to meet with their counterparts in ACPRA in Washington on October 4, 1958. For nearly three hours the group discussed ways in which activities and programs of the two organizations "might be more cooperative and perhaps more closely coordinated, even leading possibly to eventual merger." AAC officers held that merger should not be considered actively for the present "because of certain members' strong feelings against it." Fearing the likelihood that a competitive element would otherwise persist, ACPRA's officers insisted that the means and end of cooperation and even coordinated action be left open-ended. The result of the meeting was an agreement that the presidents of the two organizations "would actively and objectively seek membership reaction on cooperative and coordinated activities" during the year. The Executive Committees would then meet in the spring to assess the findings.[84]

In the months which followed, Curtis spoke at meetings of ACPRA's eleven districts, three of which were held jointly with AAC districts. At each meeting his address was the same, a careful presentation of the histories, goals, and activities of the two organizations with statistics to show the large overlap in membership and material to indicate the various ways in which the two organizations were already cooperating as well as those in which they were competing. Serious, he said, was the fact the two organizations were not only competing for members and fees but also for the service of the joint members, for attendance at district and national meetings, for the same program participants both inside and outside the organizations, for contributions to their magazines, and for the same foundation support.[85]

Discussions following Curtis' address at the district meetings considered all the options—cooperation, coexistence, merger, coordination, and partnerships. A definite and clear-cut sentiment in favor of combining the strengths of the two groups and of eliminating duplication of effort in the interest of realizing the greatest potential of service was found in all of the discussions. Many members indicated that they did not care which organization they belonged to so long as it provided the best possible service to their institutions.

On March 5 the Executive Committees of ACPRA and AAC again met jointly to hear the reports of their presidents and to discuss future relationships between the organizations. The AAC report indicated that "the present climate of opinion is that [our] organization is by no means the same as in ACPRA. Sentiment for a drawing together of the two groups," the AAC officers said, "had not advanced to the same point it had in ACPRA. Furthermore, there was definite opposition in some quarters to an intensified cooperation."

Earlier, ACPRA's Executive Committee had concluded that both organizations had been asking their members to react to organizational concepts which had never been defined clearly and were therefore subject to varied interpretations. Consequently, it drew a proposal which was submitted to AAC's Executive Committee on March 5 with the suggestion that it be acted upon by the appropriate governing boards at their respective national conventions later in 1959. The 400-word, eight-paragraph proposal, read in part:

"In recognition of the fact that the fundamental objective of both our organizations is greater service to higher education, we propose to the Executive Committee of the American Alumni Council that a joint Commission of AAC-ACPRA be appointed to create an organizational blueprint designed to encompass the areas now served by these organizations and including other appropriate services not yet undertaken. We recommend that the membership of the commission consist of four members of AAC and a like number of ACPRA, with the possibility of employing a full-time paid staff member to expedite the commission's work. . . .

"This commission would be charged with the responsibility of presenting a blueprint by April 1, 1960. The blueprint thus produced would be presented to the membership of the two organizations for approval or disapproval at the 1960 conventions.

"In line with the current policy of cooperation between our two organizations, which we feel has been mutually beneficial, we suggest as an immediate exploratory step the adoption of a policy encouraging joint district meetings from the national level. This effort should apply especially in those districts where joint meetings have not yet been held."[86]

When ACPRA opened its 1959 convention at French Lick, Indiana, on July 11, word had just been received that AAC's Board of Directors a few days earlier had passed a resolution declining ACPRA's proposal. In the first of its three paragraphs the resolution said: "The Board of Directors of the American Alumni Council believes that it can best carry on its work and render its most effective service to education as an independent organization. The board wishes to emphasize, however, its strong interest in furthering cooperation with all other appropriate educational organizations, and particularly with the American College Public Relations Association in those areas in which the two organizations have mutual interest."

After extensive discussion the ACPRA board adopted unanimously a resolution expressing regret over the decision of AAC "not to work with ACPRA in a joint study commission to find a new and cooperative means for more effective service to our respective constituencies." The resolution added that ACPRA, "recognizing its responsibilities to American higher education, reaffirms its determination to proceed in its own study, therefore, to seek a more effective organizational concept for those people professionally engaged in college and university relations and in the securing of support for higher education."

The board then adopted unanimously a recommendation presented by President-elect Osborn "that a commission of ACPRA members be appointed to make a comprehensive study of the scope, function, and organizational pattern of this Association with a view toward providing increased services for all persons engaged in advancing understanding and support of higher education." The commission, to be appointed by the president, would include three appointive members of the Association, plus the president and executive director, would have broad-gauge responsibilities, and would be expected to report its recommendations by March 1, 1960, for action by the board and the membership at the 1960 convention."[87]

AAC, by the action taken at its 1959 convention, brought to an end for the time being the hopes many had held for federation or merger, but close cooperation continued. As could be expected, the talk and the hopes were ultimately reviewed, but not until long after ACPRA had observed its Golden Anniversary were the dreams of

Curtis and other Association leaders of his era to be realized.

Through one of the year's cooperative efforts, ACPRA joined with AAC and the Council for Financial Aid to Education in sponsoring a nation-wide series of workshops on fund raising for college and university presidents. The first of these was held at French Lick, Indiana, on October 23-25, 1958, with emphasis on the president's role in gaining understanding and support for higher education.[88]

Several of the services provided for members furing 1958-59 resulted from efforts of the sections working closely with the national office. The recently organized Communications Section in February inaugurated a critique service through which all members of the Association were offered the opportunity of having each of their publications evaluated by at least three expert critics chosen from the membership of the section. During the next five months, fifteen institutions took advantage of the service. The section also formed a Media Analysis Committee to provide up-to-date information on the various media and to encourage efforts to reach national markets with educational stories. Made available to members through the work of this committee were a list of media directories, a report on newpaper syndicates, and the reactions of New York City's education editors to publicity material being distributed by colleges.

The Communications Section also planned two workshops for the summer of 1959, the first of which was held at the University of Rochester on July 20-21 with photography as its focus. The second, concentrating on publications, was scheduled for August 3-4 when it would be held at Massachusetts Institute of Technology as the first ACPRA-sponsored event of 1959-60.

The Development Section, which had forged the workshop idea in 1957-58, did not continue it in 1958-59 because of the pressure of other activities. Instead, it initiated the most ambitious service effort yet proposed, a ten-day summer institute scheduled for July 27-August 5 on the campus of Chatham College in Pittsburgh. Participants in the seminars and individual conferences composing this program included some of the country's best-known names in the fund-raising field. Originally limited to thirty, the number of participants was later increased to fifty.[89]

The ACPRA Consulting Service, several years under consideration, was finally approved by the Association's Executive Committee at its first meeting of 1958-59. From now on, the national office would serve only as a clearing house, putting institutions seeking counsel in touch with members who were experts in the areas specified. Fees and expenses as determined by mutual agreement would be paid to the consultant. Colleges and universities used the Association's Placement Service increasingly in 1958-59. The number of openings posted grew to 224 from 150 the year before, partly, at least, because of a folder, "A Service to Colleges and Universities," describing the Placement Service operation to prospective employers and applicants.[90]

ACPRA now had four sections—a new one being added and an old one dissolved. The board voted to approve bylaws for the Administrative Section, which had been proposed under the leadership of James H. Denison of Michigan State the year before, then voted to decommision the Sports Section.[91]

Membership in the Administration Section was to be open to any individual "who shall have been designated by the president or other chief administrative officer of his college or university as a person to whom such officer has delegated *primary* responsibility for administration, counseling, and interpretative functions."[92] The Medical Section continued to maintain close liaison on problems of major interest to its members, with special emphasis on state and federal regulations and codes of practice for handling release of medical information. Activities of the sections had added up to an impressive record of service, Lyle Nelson, vice president for sections, said in his report at French Lick, yet some members continued to have an uneasy feeling that work of the sections was in a measure divisive.

"The record," Nelson asserted, "would seem even more impressive but for the gnawing fear of over-specialization, of bifurcation, and of diminution of the central purposes of a great national organization devoted to the advancement of understanding and support of higher education in all its many ramifications. The problem is a serious one demanding the attention of all thoughtful members of the Association."[93]

Research related to the various fields of interest among ACPRA members was growing more important every year. In October, 1958, the Executive Committee authorized President Curtis to appoint a Committee on Research to work with the vice presidents for publications and services. Ready for the committee's consideration was a list of twelve projects which past President Jordan had drawn. When the Executive Committee met in March, Executive Secretary Johnston had plans ready for a foundation proposal to create a research program under the supervision of a full-time staff member within the national office. As a name for the program, "Research Coordinating Center of ACPRA" was proposed.[94] The June issue of *Pride* reported that the Research Committee "is working to identify problems to be studied and existing material which is now not widely known or used" and added that this action pointed "to the eventual establishment of a formal program of classification, stimulation, and dissemination of research information."[95]

Upon a recommendation made by Johnston following the 1958 convention, the Executive Committee decided that the funds and time formerly spent on the publication of convention proceedings should be used to give "more complete coverage of the convention high spots" in *Pride*.

As a result, thirteen of the sixty-seven articles carried by *Pride* in 1958-59 were addresses or papers from the 1958 convention. Most of these appeared in October and November when *Pride* published special issues devoted to development and communications. Lack of "big-name authors" among *Pride's* contributors had been criticized in past years, so in 1958-59 Editor Doty secured articles from a dozen "outside experts," among them John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation; Devereux C. Josephs, chairman of the board of New York Life Insurance Company and of President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School; Samuel B. Gould, president of Antioch College, soon to become first chancellor of the University of California at Santa Barbara; and Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., assistant commissioner for higher education of the U. S. Office of Education, who wrote a series of articles on the National Defense Act that ran in four consecutive issues of the magazine.

To help Doty secure well-known authors and improve the magazine generally, President Curtis named a Publications Committee headed by Arthur Schaefer, vice president for publications and Association services. Upon this committee's recommendations, Curtis soon named an editorial board "to provide suggestions for articles, features, and balanced content and to assist the national office in obtaining desired articles on specified subjects or by selected authors." The board included eleven persons, one from each ACPRA district.

Doty, again with the help of the Communications and Development Sections, introduced a new feature in *Pride* titled "Direction in Development" some months, "Direction in Communications" other months. The purpose of the feature, written by guest columnists, was "to present interesting observations of professionals in the fields of fund raising, publicity, and public relations."[96]

In "A Concept of Development" appearing in the January issue of *Pride*, Robert E. Nelson, assistant to the chancellor for development at the University of Kansas City, startled many of his ACPRA friends when he charged that "most of us are guilty of handling the mass detail of our offices without due reflection on how our work furthers the long-term future of our schools."

"I am becoming bored with being called a 'fund raiser'," Nelson declared. "It [use of this term] is due to a lack of general understanding of the concept of development. The purpose of the development officer is to interpret the philosophy and goals of the institution in such a manner as to actively involve the institution's publics in the achievement of those goals. Any time a development officer is forced to ask a potential donor for a gift, he has failed to the extent that he has not been able to enroll, train, and otherwise make effective the service of a volunteer—be that volunteer a faculty member, trustee, alumnus, parent, minister, businessman, or other friend who has good cause to be concerned with the institution's role in society.

"No development officer worthy of his profession looks upon his office as more than a 'service center' for volunteers and legislators in their efforts to contribute in appropriate ways to the ongoing program of his institution. The functions of public relations, publicity, publications, alumni relations, community relations, church relations, student recruitment, speaker's bureau, and special events should all be considered in this same light.

"If the development officer has one other major function," Nelson continued, "it is to insure 'continuity of effort' in the institution's long-term advancement. If the development officer is a 'fund raiser' it is only in the sense that he has been able to make possible effective solicitations on the part of volunteers, and has provided the *avenues* of support and the desire to give."[97]

John Anthony Brown, assistant to the president of Temple University, presented a somewhat different concept when he wrote an article on "Measuring a Development Program."

"A development program is, after all, a grand design to move an institution from where it is to where it has decided it wants to go," he said. "Every sound program begins with self-evaluation, proceeds through a careful study of institutional problems and resources to a final grand plan for the future. Thus a complete development program has factors of both time and space; thus it is more than buildings and money."

Critically, Brown wrote: 'The quest for financial support has caused some of us to come close to substituting the outstretched tin cup for the lamp of learning as the symbol of higher education. The universities do not need the charitable dollars of a nation that feels sorry for underpaid faculties. The nation needs to be shown the importance to it of these universities. . . . The development office which has raised a million dollars cannot sit smugly in self-satisfaction if its alumni are strangers, and its community is quiet and unexcited about the role of education in the making of tomorrow."[98]

In an article called "Broader Horizons for Interpreting Education," Gould emphasized his conviction that the public relations officer for a college or university is primarily an interpreter of educational philosophy.

"The kind of task I am describing," he wrote, "is not for the journeyman. It is not for the fugitive from the advertising agency whose ulcers nag him to search for quieter arenas of activity. Nor is it for the loyal alumnus who has never quite found himself in the business world and yearns once more for the groves of academe where he can smoke his pipe and wear his tweeds in a euphoric aura of perpetual youth. It is not even for the faculty member who, disheartened and dismayed by the unwillingness of students to accept his words without challenge, seeks sanctuary behind the modern office furniture, dictaphones and 'incoming' and 'outgoing' baskets of the administration. This is rather the task for the man who feels that hot breath of education's emergency upon him in almost searing fashion and who looks upon his college or university as one of the barricades thrown up against the tide of ignorance and spiritual bankruptcy that is a never ending threat to survival. It is a task for the man with power, with patience, with tenacity, with perspective, with prescience.

"In finding broader horizons for interpreting education the public relations officer is a key figure. With such a role he takes on stature and significance in the educational scheme of things. With such a role his academic respectability and his place in the sun cannot be successfully challenged for he is equal to his colleagues, a generalist and an expert, a philosopher and a practitioner, a researcher for truth in the best academic and intellectual tradition."[99]

How an educational institution can gain favorable publicity on an international scale was outlined for ACPRA members by Lynn Poole, former president of the Association, in an article in *Pride*. In it he revealed how the public relations office at John Hopkins had taken material in its files from eleven years of producing the ABC television show, "Johns Hopkins File 7," and created a weekly newspaper column which soon was being carried by ninety-seven newspapers in thirty-seven states and Canada, plus outlets abroad via the United States Information Agency (USIA). The column covered a variety of subjects such as future possibilities of solar energy, the swashbuckling knights of Medieval Europe, new facts about the human eye, and the problems of old age.

"The basic objective of the column," Poole told *Pride's* readers, "is to enhance the reputation of Johns Hopkins, attract superior students, stimulate alumni, and at the same time carry the idea that all human advancement begins with education. . . . I have been asked to explain the success of the column. No one can point at a direct cause. But I feel that it may be because we treat the column's content as though it had no connection with an institution, and write it as any columnist might who is trying to produce a newsworthy, worthwhile feature for a wide reading public."[100] The column continued popular with a growing number of readers until Poole's death in 1969.

Outlining the steps colleges need to take to assure understanding and support, Francis Pray emphasized in a *Pride* article the essentiality of specific programs to develop trustees, faculty, students, and alumni as major resources for public relations and fund raising.

"I have an increasingly strong conviction," wrote Pray, by this time vice president of college relations for the Council for Financial Aid to Education, "that an effective public relations job for an institution could be done by an adroit public relations or development officer, a close staff associate of the president, who spent very little of his time running publicity programs or organizing campaigns. This man would, however, spend a great deal of his time *helping the president* make sure that every element of an institution understood its purpose, shared a conviction as to its essentiality, and was willing to work for its success. If he could do this, then the job of getting public support and understanding would be relatively simple."[101]

In May, 1959, Executive Secretary Johnston announced that the United States Steel Foundation "has recognized the efforts of ACPRA to provide more accurate and complete research information by a grant of $5,000 for research activity." Because the Association's tax exemption appeal was still pending, Colorado College accepted the gift, through W. Robert Brossman, the college's vice president for public relations and ACPRA's vice president for districts and membership.[102]

The United States Steel gift was especially welcome because of plans for a larger research program and the fact that finances were still tight. In budgeting for the year, the Executive Committee had anticipated a loss of fifty institutional members because of the increase in dues. Actually, the net loss in institutional memberships was only twenty-five, but individual memberships fell to 1,588 as compared to 1,639 the previous year. Because of a change in accounting procedures, the Association showed a deficit of $1,661 for the year, with an income of $60,408 and expenses of $62,069.[103]

ACPRA completed its year with a convention that drew more than 700 members to French Lick, Indiana, for a program featuring "how-to-do-it" seminars for newcomers and a host of seminars on the "whys" for more experienced members. Public relations officers from the Association of American Universities, the State Universities Association, the American Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education held special meetings in connection with the convention. So, too, did those from church-related colleges under the auspices of the National Council of Churches.

The newly-recognized Administrative Section of ACPRA held its organizational meeting and elected James H. Denison of Michigan State as its first chairman. Because concurrent sessions of equal interest to ACPRA members were being held, the Association for the first time made arrangements for speeches and panels to be covered with hight fidelity recordings which then became available to members at from $5 to $7.50 each.

ACPRA at its awards banquet conferred awards for distinguished service to higher education upon John W. Gardner "for his consistently farsighted and enlightened leadership of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and for his brilliant and perceptive chairmanship of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund Panel on Education which produced the significant report, 'The Pursuit of Excellence'," and upon W. Homer Turner "for his pioneering efforts in influencing corporate support of higher education as executive director for the United States Steel Foundation and as a valued adviser and counselor to countless presidents and college officials."

More than 700 entries were received for ACPRA's 1959 college competition of publications and projects, all on display at French Lick. The professional judges finally decided that nine were worthy of "first awards" and forty-five others deserved "awards of merit."[104]

In its meeting at French Lick the Executive Committee determined that the Association's 1961 convention would be held in Denver while that for 1962 would be held at the Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia. The 1960 convention, in accordance with an earlier decision, would be held in Washington, D. C., concurrently with the convention of the American Alumni Council.[105]

Noel Johnton, whose tenure as executive since 1955 had seen ACPRA make advances on all fronts, announced to the Executive Committee that he was resigning as of September 1 to become vice president for public relations at Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware, Ohio. The board later announced that Frank L. Ashmore, director of public relations and development at Randolph Macon Women's College, would be Johnston's successor.[106]

Delegates to the convention named Lyle M. Nelson of the University of Michigan as president-elect and advanced Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., of Washington University to the presidency. Other officers elected were: secretary-treasurer, Horace W. Hewlett, Amherst College, and vice presidents, Raymond F. Carmichael, Manhattan College, development; Arthur Schaefer, DePaul University, publications and Association services, reelected; and Neal O. Hines, University of Washington, sections.[107]

In his presidential address at the convention banquet, Howard Curtis hurled a challenge to statesmanship to his colleagues in ACPRA.

"Now statesmanship is a very large concept," Curtis declared, "and some of you may believe that it is too large to be applied to the job of college public relations. But Webster offers a definition which I consider perfectly appropriate for an organization such as ACPRA, and that is, and I quote, 'wisdom in treating or directing public matters'. Certainly the matters with which education, and we as advocates of education, are concerned, can legitimately be considered public matters. . . . ACPRA, like the world at large, is full of big problems, but also full of perplexing details that tend to mess up the big problems. Our capacity to deal successfully with both will be the mark of our bigness as individuals—and as an organization."[108]

A Year of Fulfillment

"ACPRA has only one justification for existence—to advance higher education," Association President Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., declared in one of his early messages to the membership. "Every action that is undertaken in the name of our Association," he added, "should be challenged by the question: 'Will this help in creating better understanding and stimulating support for our colleges and universities?' "[109]

"For ACPRA, this is a 'Year of Fulfillment'," he said a few months later in opening his report made at the annual convention in Washington's Sheraton Park Hotel. "The impact of the year on the life of the Association and its members," he added, "centered around *three* vital parts of our total program."

First, and most far-reaching in importance, Osborn said, was the completion of a searching self-study made by the Study Commission created at the 1959 convention. The second significant action, and a companion to the first, was the successful culmination of the Association's three-year struggle to gain tax-exempt status. The third factor in making 1959-60 a year of fulfillment for ACPRA was the joint conference being held in Washington by ACPRA and the American Alumni Council as Osborn made his report.

"The recommendations of the Study Commission," Osborn commented, "open new gates of opportunity for advancing understanding and support of higher education. In my humble opinion they represent the greatest forward step ever taken by the Association." The cooperative efforts of ACPRA and AAC in planning the joint conference in Washington had, Osborn believed, "produced *the* outstanding educational experience to date for those of us engaged in educational public relations, fund raising, or alumni relations.

"As the program plans progressed, and the road blocks to cooperation proved to be more imaginary than real," Osborn continued, "it was evident that each association was stimulating the other to produce its very best effort. By meeting together we are eliminating a great deal of our mutual suspicion and learning that the dedication to education we hold in common makes us not cousins but brothers."[110]

The report of the Study Commission to which Osborn attached such great importance was the last of a series of projects started four years earlier to reevaluate the principles and practices of institutional programs designed to achieve greater public support for higher education, and the role of ACPRA in assisting colleges and universities in this area of activity.

The original committee, appointed by Lynn Poole in the summer of 1956 (known at first as the Survey Committee, then as the Study Committee) had determined, under the leadership of Everett H. Hopkins, to concentrate on two objectives. The first of these—"a thorough, scholarly and objective study of those areas of college and university administration that are either involved directly with or are closely related to the internal and external public relations of individual colleges and universities"—had been accomplished through the Greenbrier Conference and the publication of *The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education*.

The approach to the committee's second major objective—"the formulation of long-range goals and objectives for ACPRA and the definition of programs, services, and organization structure through which these objectives could be realized"—took a different course after the Greenbrier Conference, which was planned and staged with the help of the American Alumni Council. As a result of that conference, members of both groups found that their long-range plans, which might even involve eventual federation or merger, hinged on answers to questions concerning cooperative, coordinated, or individual programs which might be undertaken by the two associations. Consequently, the officers and governing boards of the two organizations in 1958-59 explored the question of future interassociation relationships. In July, 1959, AAC officials voted against taking any further steps toward merger, and ACPRA's Executive Committee and Board of Directors adopted unanimously a resolution authorizing President Osborn to appoint a five-man Study Commission to undertake the task which the original Survey Committee had identified as its second objective in 1956.[111]

In addition to establishing long-range goals for the Association and defining programs, services, and effective organizational structure designed to realize these goals, the new commission was instructed to draft the bylaws necessary to implement its recommendations. The commission was directed to complete its work on a schedule which would enable the Board of Directors and members of the Association to act upon its recommendations no later than the summer of 1960.

Tom W. VanArsdale, Jr., executive vice president of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, was appointed chairman of the commission. W. Noel Johnston, ACPRA's former executive director and now vice president for public relations at Ohio Wesleyan University, and President-elect Lyle Nelson, director of university relations at the University of Michigan, became the other appointed members. President Osborn and Executive Director Frank Ashmore served on the commission *ex officio*.[112]

The commission held monthly sessions from October through April, in most cases for two-and-a-half days. As a basis for its discussion it solicited suggestions from members of the Association, and received over 400 letters.[113] It also sought the suggestions of executive officers of national associations and agencies, presidents of colleges and universities, representatives of foundations, chairmen of ACPRA's four sections, and directors of its eleven districts. It reviewed the history of the Association, minutes of the Association and its governing boards, reports of officers, reports of the Plans and Policies Committees of the 1940s, and reports of special "task force" committees. It studied the constitution, bylaws, and organizational structures of half a dozen other educational associations and those sections of *Robert's Rules of Order* which established procedures for assuring maximum efficiency without sacrificing individual privileges and rights within an organization. It also studied the legal definition of an educational association as established by the Interal Revenue Code of 1954 and interpreted in Treasury Regulations published in June, 1959. And on occasion the commission sought the advice of legal counsel and outside consultants.[114]

The result of this intensive job of fact-gathering, analysis, debate, and testing of ideas was a sixty-page report whose major focus was on a series of seven conclusions and as many recommendations.

In the first of its conclusions the commission emphasized that the paramount purpose of the Association "must be the advancement of higher education with special emphasis on service to its own member institutions." The other conclusions were that the Association must: (1) serve all of the many functions included within the broad area of institutional advancement programs; (2) provide vigorous leadership in identifying and developing increasingly effective principles and practices for achieving understanding and support; (3) provide leadership in interpreting the value of effective programs of institutional advancement; (4) increase significantly its efforts to help in solving the shortage of qualified personnel in this area of administration; (5) increase its ability to serve the special interests of the growing number of subgroups in the Association; and (6) explore aggressively—but carefully—new areas of service through which members might enhance their own capacity to secure increased understanding and support.[115]

Saying that the name, "American College Public Relations Association," "fails to convey the full scope of the affairs of the Association," the commission's first recommendation was a change of name for the organization. "The commission," said the report, "recommends that the Association be renamed the *Association for the Advancement of* understanding and support of *Higher Education*, with the name so presented typographically in the Association letterhead and all publications that the words 'understanding and support of' will provide definition of the meaning of the word 'advancement' without being necessary in conversational references to the Association."[116] The commission expected that the Association would be familiarly known as AAHE.

Other recommendations made by the commission were:

(1) *That the interest areas now partially represented by sections be represented in the future by three councils and an indeterminate number of commissions, to be organized as interest and demand warrant*. The three councils recommended were to represent three major areas of functional responsibility: educational public relations, educational fund raising, and the coordination and administration of total advancement programs. Each council would include nine member-representatives elected by the members, three each year for terms of three years.

(2) *That the governing board of the Association be reorganized*. The commission proposed that the present fifty-eight member Board of Directors be replaced by a twenty-four

member Board of Trustees. (The size of the board was growing rapidly because both the districts and the sections, under the constitution, elected one director "for each fifty institutional members or part thereof represented in each of them.") The current practice of electing directors for one-year periods would be changed so that trustees would be elected for periods of three years, with one-third of the members to be replaced each year. The board would be composed of one trustee from each of the eleven districts, three trustees from each council, three elected at large by the board, and the executive officer of the Association, *ex officio*, without vote.

The board's membership was soon raised to twenty-five, through an amendment which made the past president a member for one year following completion of his term.

(3) *That the nomination and election procedures of the Association be revised*. For most of the Association's history, past presidents had served as a Nominating Committee. With the Association's membership now above 1,600 this practice no longer seemed feasible. In accordance with recommendations made by the Study Commission, the Board of Trustees would henceforth elect its own officers—a president, a president-elect, and a secretary-treasurer—who would also be president, president-elect, and secretary-treasurer of the Association. The trustees would also name three of their number to serve with the officers on an Executive Committee. Trustees representing the districts and those representing the councils would be elected by their own bodies in the manner they themselves determined.

(4) *That the responsibility and freedom of action of the governing board be increased*. This recommendation would charge the board with "the responsibility for total Association programs and services, the establishment of fees and representation privileges by members and educational associates, the awarding of honors and citations, the authorization and dissolution of commissions, and approval of projects and proposals to be presented to any group as a request for financial assistance."

(5) *That the responsibilities and freedom of action of the Association's executive officer and national office staff be redefined and increased, and that this redefinition be reflected by changing the title of the executive officer from executive director to executive vice president*. The commission recommended that the executive officer be given full responsibility for administration of the budget, Association publications and services, membership promotion, fund procurement, liaison with other organizations, preparation of materials for the assistance of district and national officers, contracts and arrangements for conventions, workshops and institutes, personnel and placement for member institutions, and such other responsibilities as the board might from time to time direct.

(6) *That the Association appoint, through its Board of Trustees, an advisory board of eminent individuals to serve in an advisory and consultative capacity for the trustees*. This advisory group, the commisssion recommended, should represent a variety of interests and "be organized to review programs and plans of the Association, to suggest new activities to be undertaken by the Association, and otherwise provide the advantages of the disinterested yet responsible point of view in evaluating the affairs of the Association."

To implement the reorganization measures recommended, the Study Commission urged four steps: (1) that the actions recommended be effected on August 1, 1961; (2) that a survey of members be made "to determine their interests in the establishment of commissions, and that the initial commissions be determined by the Executive Committee and directors during the fiscal year, 1960-61"; (3) that the Executive Committee for 1960-61 "take appropriate steps, preferably through a survey of member representatives, to determine those commissions which should be established at the time other changes are effected, with particular attention to determining needs for Commissions on Alumni Relations, Governmental Relations, Medical and Health Affairs, and one or more areas of Church Relations"; and (4) that, provided the reorganization of the Association was approved, "procedures be undertaken by the appropriate groups to assure that councilors, commissioners, and trustees for 1961-62 would be elected and notified of their election at least forty-five days prior to the organizational meeting of these groups on or about July 1, 1961."[117]

In sessions held just before the annual convention in Washington, on July 10, 1960, both the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors voted unanimous approval of the Study Commission's proposals and recommendations. The latter also directed that the report be submitted to the membership for final decision as provided by the bylaws.[118] Before this was done in November, 1960, it was decided not to ask for approval of the proposed new name because strong objections had been raised that it was too long and unwieldy. All other recommendations of the Study Commission were included in the new Articles of Organization and bylaws submitted to the members, who approved them by a vote of 490 to 3 in December, 1960.[119]

For the second time within eight months, members had approved new Articles of Organization and bylaws for the Association. Since October, 1956, ACPRA had been negotiating with attorneys and officers of the Internal Revenue Service to gain status enabling the Association to receive gifts and grants which would be tax exempt to the donors. Finally, the Executive Committee determined to meet IRS objections to the Association's bylaws by replacing them with Articles of Organization and a revised set of bylaws.

On April 28, 1960, the committee approved the bylaws as altered by the executive director and the Association's attorneys in consultation with the IRS. The changes were then approved by the Board of Directors and submitted to the membership which gave its approval, 384 to 0. When the Articles of Organization and bylaws went into effect on June 1, the Executive Committee submitted a new application to the IRS. On July 13 at the Washington convention, it became President Osborn's "very pleasant duty" to announce that the IRS had issued a favorable decision granting ACPRA full tax-exempt status beginning on August 1.[120]

The Articles of Organization adopted in May, 1960, and those adopted in December, 1960, both spelled out that ACPRA was to serve "as an exclusively charitable and education organization within the meaning of Section 501 (C) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."[121]

Among the many changes made in the bylaws adopted in December, 1960, one of the most important related to dues. In the past, dues were set by a vote of the membership after changes had been recommended by the Board of Directors. The new bylaws authorized the trustees to establish the fee schedule. For the guidance of trustees, however, the Study Commission had recommended a dues schedule which called for fees ranging from $50 a year for institutions with enrollment under 300, to $125 for those with 5,000 or more students. The number of member-representatives would also vary from one to four depending on the dues paid. Dues suggested for educational agencies were $100, with the privilege of two representatives. Both institutions and educational agencies, the commission said, should have the privilege of enrolling additional representatives at a fee of $10 each.[122]

The joint conference of ACPRA and the American Alumni Council, the third factor in making 1959-60 a "Year of Fulfillment" in President Osborn's opinion, drew more than 800 ACPRA members to Washington on July 10-14. It was the largest convention in the Association's history to date. The five-day conference, with the two organizations meeting in neighboring hotels, attracted a total of 2,118 representatives, wives, children, and guests. Arthur L. Brandon, vice president for univerity relations at New York University, was program chairman for the ACPRA-sponsored sessions and J. Alfred Guest of Amherst College was AAC's conference chairman. Together they built a program which included some 200 general and special interest sessions. Joint sessions alternated between the hotels and for part of each day delegates had the privilege of choosing among as many as twelve programs running concurrently.[123]

Although work of the Study Commission, negotiations with IRS, and the joint conference with AAC received major attention in 1959-60, ACPRA made advances in every facet of its growing program. Special emphasis was placed on service projects, several of which were sponsored by one or more of the Association's districts or sections.

Individuals from twenty-one states attended the first summer Institute for Development Officers held at Chatham College early in August, 1959. The program was so successful that plans were made to hold a second such institute at Lake Forest (Illinois) College on August 7-17, 1960. Also scheduled for August were a four-day Workshop on Publications at Michigan State University and the first of a projected series of institutes on the theme, "The Changing Role of Public Relations." Titled "The Application of Social Science and Research to the Practice of Public Relations," the institute would be held August 21-27 at Syracuse University where the first ACPRA workshop on public relations had been held in 1944.[124] With enrollment limited to sixty, an Institute on College and University Administration was held June 20-24 at the University of Michigan.

ACPRA also continued to cooperate with the Council for Financial Aid to Education in sponsorship of regional conferences for college and university presidents. By the end of December, 1959, eight of these had been held and a dozen more were in the planning stage for 1960 and 1961. "Perhaps no event in the history of educational public relations has done so much to solve this [public relations] problem," Executive Director Frank Ashmore commented in *Pride*. Before the series was concluded every college and university president in the country would be invited to participate and attendance figures for the first eight conferences indicated that more than half of them would do so.[125]

A new program of informal one-day open houses, held at a college or university within each state of an ACPRA district, met with instant success and enthusiasm. These meetings were the brain-child of James W. Jackson, Jr., director of the sustaining associates program at Washington University, St. Louis. They each treated in depth some aspect of public relations, development, or alumni work in which the host institution had a special competence.[126]

Meetings meant to help directors and other officers of the districts do their work more effectively were held for the first time in 1959-60. District directors joined with the national office staff and the vice president for districts and membership, Raymond Carmichael, in Washington November 6-7 for "a free wheeling discussion of purposes, programs, and problems on the national, district, and state levels." Because lack of continuity in the management of district affairs had been a perennial problem, a meeting of outgoing and incoming elected and appointed district officers—there were now more than 200 of them at any given time—was held on the opening day of the 1960 convention in Washington.[127]

Services meant to help members, newcomers especially, achieve greater effectiveness in the various areas of their work were introduced or expanded during the year. Organized the previous year with a panel of seven experts, the Publications Critique Service was used by more than 100 institutions, and the panel of experts was enlarged to twenty-eight.[128] Organized and run since 1952 by Alvie Smith and A. Westley Rowland of Michigan State, the New Member Packet Service had by 1960 sent 2,543 packets to approximately 500 new member institutions.

A new service from the national office was a series of FYI Folders, the nucleus of a loan library which became increasingly popular in the 1960s. Each folder brought together articles on specific subjects from *Pride*, its predecessor, the *College Public Relations Quarterly*, the office reference library, and other sources. By July, 1960, folders were available on such subjects as organizing public relations, organizing development, working with and for faculty, special gifts, development office records, the college catalog, photography, foundations, special events, and advertising.[129] The Association's gradually-expanding reference library had been indexed by the national office and the number of requests for material continued to grow. The national office had also built a card file containing information on most of the films issued by or about member institutions.[130] The first bibliography of public relations programs prepared since 1951 became available through the national office. It was prepared by Leo C. Muller, director of university relations at the University of Buffalo. Two other bibliographies, "Readings and Source Materials for the Development Office" and a single-page list on educational television, were also made available to members.[131]

The Placement Service handled more than 200 positions during the year with an average of ten referrals for each opening. The service was losing money for the Association and the Executive Committee authorized the executive director to charge a fee of $25 for nonmember institutions and a fee of $10 for individuals using the service.[132]

The President's Seminars, sponsored by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, had highlighted the fact that many presidents were eager for consultation with an experienced person concerning procedures for achieving understanding and support for their institutions. Therefore, plans were completed for the Consulting Service ACPRA had been considering for several years and details were announced in May, 1960. Folders outlining the program were mailed to all members and also to presidents of nonmember institutions. Thirty-three unlisted consultants recommended by district and section officers and finally selected by an anonymous committee were available to give council on questions ranging from long-range institutional goals to establishing efficient office practices and procedures. Institutions needing counsel were invited to make their needs known to the national office, which would then supply the names of three or more consultants particularly qualified in the areas mentioned. The institution would select the consultant desired and pay a fee of $125 a day, plus travel expenses, with ACPRA retaining $25 of the fee. Any arrangement for later service was to be made between the institution and the consultant.[133]

By mail ballot early in 1960, the Executive Committee authorized establishment of the Research Coordinating Center under discussion since 1957. A project destined to play a major role in ACPRA's growing service and stature during the 1960s, this center in the national office would seek: (1) to make available to member institutions and their representatives results of research of particular value in the areas of the social sciences, communications, education, and business; (2) to identify areas in which research needed to be done to meet present needs of members; (3) to enlist the aid of individuals qualified to do research, develop instruments for use by member institutions, and instruct members in research procedures; and (4) to secure funds both to staff the center adequately and to finance projects which would contribute to the advancement of the Association's objectives. Also anticipated were the appointment of a committee of individuals from outside ACPRA to serve as an advisory group, and the scheduling of a small conference of Association representatives and qualified specialists from other fields to explore possible areas of service to be rendered.

While awaiting completion of plans for the new center, ACPRA's Research Committee, headed by Robert E. Nelson, vice chancellor for development at the University of Kansas City, started a project that led eventually to the establishment of *Education Abstracts* as a monthly publication of the Association in 1963. In this project fifty-three periodicals were sent to as many individuals with the request that they read future issues and prepare digests of articles promising to be of special interest to Association members.[134] The digests were then published in the Association magazine.

The national office, working under the direction of Frank Ashmore and a strong Executive Committee headed by Osborn, was now pacing the enlargement of Association services. However, the sections and districts, led by volunteers, continued to make great contributions to the Association's overall program. By the end of its first year of activity the Administration Section had 182 members. The Communications Section continued to be the largest with 787 members, while the Development Section listed 567 and the Medical and Health Section, 118.[135] A few individuals held membership in more than one section. One or more of the sections and districts cooperated with the national office in sponsoring most of the institutes, workshops, seminars, and open houses held during the year.

For the Medical and Health Section, oldest of the four sections, 1960 was a landmark year. In May, the Association's Board of Directors gave approval to bylaws for the section. Because bylaws of the group, organized in 1950 and given official recognition two years later, had never received formal approval, a new set had been drawn up at the San Francisco convention. However, a series of revisions needed to make them consistent with the national bylaws delayed final approval for two more years.[136] Among the Association's eleven districts another boundary change was made. Upon the request of Kentucky members, that state was transferred from the Great Lakes to the Southeastern District.[137]

While enlarging its own services ACPRA continued, and in several instances initiated, cooperative efforts with other national organizations interested in higher education and public relations. The Association supplied resource persons and materials for most of the President's Seminars sponsored by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and chairmen or panelists for important sessions of the National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education of NEA. Four representatives of ACPRA were named to serve on the 1960 Educational Advisory Council of the Public Relations Society of America during its development of a "universal and comprehensive public relations curriculum."[138] ACPRA representatives from twenty-one states met for two days with the Southern Regional Education Board to work out ways in which SREB, ACPRA and individuals in the Association could cooperate to give maximum impact to a new and larger information program planned by the SREB.[139] Lesser cooperative efforts were undertaken with the U. S. Office of Education and the National Association of Accrediting. The major cooperative effort with the American Alumni Council was, of course, the joint national conference, but other activities of both organizations benefitted from almost daily liaison between their national offices.

ACPRA's magazine, still edited by George Doty, gave its readers enlarged coverage in 1959-60. The March issue of forty-eight pages, concentrating on publications editing and production, was the largest yet produced. Dozens of the year's more important articles, such as those in the January issue bearing the theme, "Charting a Course for College Public Relations," were made available in reprints at a nominal cost.

"One highly significant change in privately-supported universities in this country has come so quietly, so imperceptibly, in the last two decades that it has been noticed by very few," Edgar M. Gemmell, administrative vice president at Princeton University, said in the January issue's lead article, "Public Relations Challenges for Eggheads and Hardheads." "That change," he asserted, "is simply this: Institutions which once were 'private' are now 'public'. . . .

"In the last decade, educational administrators slowly have been learning to live with the new conditions. Many have come to realize that they are conducting the affairs of their institutions in the full view of multiple publics which are intensely interested in their performance. True, a few college presidents or trustees may think that they have recognized the importance of the new conditions if they have added a news bureau to the administration, staffed it with able young men from nearby newspapers, named it the 'Public Relations Department', and hurried on to more important matters. This procedure reveals almost total unawareness of the new situation in which colleges and universities live today, and this blind spot can be dangerous. Failure to grasp the magnitude of the new dimensions can be as grave an institutional danger as academic deterioration or financial bankruptcy. The service of an efficient news bureau is essential to any communications program, but it is necessary to understand that a news bureau can handle only one aspect of a many-faceted administrative function. Those who hurry on to what they think are more important matters are mistaken. There *are* no more important matters for a university president than disseminating understanding of his institution, both inside its walls and outside among its multiple constituencies. Our predecessors of an earlier generation would find the present importance of a university's public relations simply incredible, but the ablest among them, I am confident, would have met the challenge joyfully and exploited to the fullest extent the opportunity it represents. . . .

"Appeasement . . . in this generation gets you nowhere," Gemmell declared. "Tact and diplomacy are essential up to a point—the combustion point. There they become surrender, and compliance must be abandoned." Gemmell defined good public relations as "doing the honest thing, no matter what prevailing opinion is, and doing it in a way which demonstrates reasoned foresight, a conscientious consideration of others, and most importantly, in a way which preserves the greatest asset of an institution—its integrity."[140]

In the February issue of *Pride*, Frank Ashmore made his own case for integrity, some of it in bluntly critical phrases. As the Association's executive director, he had devoted his "Headquarters Highlights" column, not to items of Association activity, but to his own concerns about ACPRA's image and needs for improvement.

"One topic which creeps into every conversation in ACPRA circles these days," he wrote, "concerns the competitive aspects of college financing. (In all too many cases, the intensity of tone shown reveals bruised feelings and scars of old and new wounds, real or imagined.) In many of these conversations there is the clear implication that ACPRA 'ought to do something about' the statements and ideas which are held to be misleading or false. In some quarters, there is the further implication that ACPRA has taken sides on these issues. ACPRA has no position, officially or unofficially. The executive director of ACPRA, as an individual, does have a position which should, in fairness to all, be clear.

"America needs institutions of all types, in every section of the country, liberal arts, vocational and professional, large and small, for the average student and the brilliant mind, rural and urban, resident and nonresident.

"There are reasons for the existence of all these institutions. Each can make a case for its own reason-for-being by stating clearly, simply, and precisely its own objectives and the policies employed to attain these objectives.

"Those who base the case for their own institutions—wholly or part—upon generalized arguments which declare one type of institution inherently superior, display ignorance of the true facts today or intellectual dishonesty, or both. They forget, too, that overgeneralization separates the politician from the statesman, the professional journalist from the hack, the articulate from the inarticulate.

"Those who go further to the characterization of other institutions in such terms as 'Godless' or 'socialized' or 'elite' forget that the negative argument is always weak—and the device of those too lazy to argue positively. These are the tactics of neither the politician nor the hack, but of the demagogue and the huckster.

"Argument—honest argument—we should and must have. Conviction that our own institution is uniquely worthwhile we must have. Competition for students, teachers, and funds shall and should remain.

"We cannot afford to be unduly sensitive to the tactics of the ignorant and the prejudiced. They shall remain among us, and some will follow them. Let us hope more leaders will refuse to capitalize on public prejudice and ignorance, and that the larger crowds will follow those who shape a deeper, broader, and multiple-faceted image of higher education. In America, we have staked everything on the belief that the worthwhile cause needs only a careful, honest, positive, and articulate presentation in order to survive. Our programs and statements should reflect this commitment."[141]

When the Executive Committee held its first meeting of 1959-60 in October, it had agreed that the Association, despite a dip of nearly fifty in membership the preceding year, "should not recruit members merely to increase numbers, but should assure all its members that ACPRA can afford them useful service." An institution-by-institution check on colleges and universities listed in the U. S. Office of Education *Directory* revealed that the Association's potential for growth in institutional members was much less than formerly believed. Of more than

1,000 institutions still nonmembers of ACPRA, only about 320 could be considered, by the arbitrary criteria of size and type, as likely prospective members. With more than 130 individuals involved in the effort to carry complete information of membership benefits to the 320, the Association ended the year with 1,631 members, only eight below 1958's record high of 1,639.[142] Meanwhile, however, it became necessary to advise honorary members that, in accordance with changes required by the IRS, adoption of the bylaws would eliminate that category of membership. The Association had granted honorary membership to sixteen individuals since 1941 and ten of these were still living.[143]

Although expenses of the Association for 1959-60 were the highest in its history—$73,572—income was also highest. The fiscal year ended with an excess of $1,732 over expenses.[144]

At the awards banquet at the Washington convention, nearly seventy citations were presented in the National Honor Competitions in recognition of excellence in public relations and development projects, publications, education news, and audio-visual media. For the first time "Best in the Nation" awards were conferred. The winners were the University of California for public relations and development projects, the University of Chicago, publications; Johns Hopkins University, education news; and Iowa State University, audio-visual media. ACPRA's award for distinguished service to higher education was presented to Terry Ferrer, education editor of *Newsweek*, "a brilliant reporter and level-headed interpreter of the complexity of American education, deeply committed to the goals of good schools for all and excellence in our colleges and universities . . ." The award for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education was presented to James Jordan, director of university relations at the University of Iowa and former ACPRA president, "in recognition of his contributions in making clear to us and others the urgency of the tasks of the colleges and universities in modern America."[145]

Delegates to the Washington convention named the following officers at their business session: President-elect, Arthur J. Schaefer, DePaul; secretary-treasurer, Ray F. Carmichael, Manhattan College; vice presidents, Leo Geier, Stanford University, districts and membership; Horace W. Hewlett, Amherst College, sections; and H. Russell Bintzer, Carnegie Institute of Technology, publications and Association services. Lyle M. Nelson, University of Michigan, president-elect during the year just closing, assumed the presidency.[146]

Marvin Osborn, ACPRA's president during 1959-60, was one of the Association's few second generation leaders. For three of the pioneering years (1922-25) when the organization was known as the American Association of College News Bureaus, Marvin G. Osborn, Sr., had been the national vice president. Born during the year his father was first elected to the vice presidency, ACPRA's current president got his start in public relations while earning his master's in journalism at Louisiana State University, his alma mater, and the institution where his father headed the journalism department (later school) for more than thirty years.

Undoubtedly, President Osborn felt that 1959-60 was a year of fulfillment for ACPRA because he saw the Association and its members growing in achievement and stature as he traveled the length and breadth of the land stressing the need for "Perpetual Rediscovery." Later *Pride* published that address for the benefit of those unable to hear his message at district meetings.

"In our deliberations at ACPRA's district and national meetings there is one basic element which we have tended to neglect," Osborn told his co-workers. "That element is you—you and me—the *individuals* engaged in college and university public relations and fund raising. Specifically, I wish to propose for your consideration a two-point program that will enable us to take a giant step forward in advancing understanding and support of higher education.

"Point One: Discover new talent to bolster our ranks. Attracting greater numbers of *qualified* people into this work should be accepted as a personal assignment by each one of us. We need to spread the word that *many* colleges have very desirable positions unfilled. . . .

"The second point of my proposal calls for a critical and searching self-evaluation by each one of us. I am convinced that the greatest untapped potential in our particular area of college administration is the *unused* talent and ability stored up in you and in me and in our counterparts throughout the nation. . . .

"We get too involved with the details of our work and become more mechanical than creative," Osborn continued. "But what is far worse is that we are often too busy to read and to study and to stretch our minds with new ideas. . . . We spend our time doing the things we like to do and often neglect those responsibilities which are not particularly enjoyable. . . . We have allowed disputes to develop within the educational family which drain away our energies into wasted channels. . . .

"No one can deny that we have an exciting assignment in exciting times. . . . To keep pace with the demands that are being made on us, we will have to adjust ourselves to greater pressures and tensions and produce results which dwarf all our previous achievements. As individuals, we must be more inventive and more imaginative than ever before. We will have to work harder at the job of creative thinking. We will be forced to search diligently for fresh ideas. . . .

"One of the most valuable suggestions I have heard," Osborn declared, "came from Dr. John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation. 'What we must reach for', he said, 'is a conception of *perpetual self-discovery, perpetual reshaping* to realize one's goals, *to realize one's best self*, to be the person one could be'.

"Self-discovery, perpetual reshaping, to realize one's best self . . . these," declared Osborn, "are words and phrases that are worth rolling around slowly in our mind just as we might roll some fine vintage champagne around on our tongue. This is the kind of exercise we need to take more often—*a lot* more often. . . .

"I believe that at this stage of our professional growth," Osborn concluded, "the greatest single and *immediate* contribution we can make to higher education is to commit *ourselves* to the *perpetual rediscovery* of our individual capabilities and to apply these with great vigor to the assignment for which *we* have volunteered.

"When we know ourselves and understand the power of dedication that lies within us, we will be ready to accept the challenge so beautifully stated by Dr. Albert Schweitzer: 'Nothing of real value in the world is ever accomplished without enthusiasm and self-sacrifice'."[147]

9

Expansion in the Early Sixties

A New Year Of Preparation

Just as 1959-60 could be termed a "Year of Fulfillment" for ACPRA, 1960-61 could be called a "Year of Preparation." The former year had produced the Study Commission report with near assurance that the revised Articles of Organization and bylaws it recommended would be ratified by the membership to become effective on August 1, 1961. Tax-exempt status now paved the way for receipt of grants with which to finance a broader program of services. A joint conference of ACPRA and AAC had been held. With ratification of the new articles and bylaws all but certain, it was evident to the Executive Committee and Board of Directors that they must now concentrate on those steps needed to assure a smooth transition to the reorganized structure with its promise of much enlarged services.

Because the vote of the membership on the new Articles of Organization and bylaws had not yet been taken, the Association's Executive Committee confined itself largely to discussing finances and brainstorming on long-range potential when it held its fall meeting in Washington on September 26-27. The budget for 1960-61, with some increases in services anticipated, was set at $96,337, a thirty-one percent increase over expenses of the preceding year. It was apparent that operation under the new structure, with provision for greater services, would push expenditures even higher in 1961-62 and succeeding years, and considerable attention was given to possible sources of gifts and grants.

By the time the Executive Committee held a special session in New York City on January 4, 1961, the Association's reorganization plans had been ratified. The New York City meeting examined the Association's current financial situation, gave attention to present services, staff needs and costs, and laid the groundwork for the Association's first concerted efforts to solicit gifts and grants needed for the reorganization.[1] The committee estimated that the budget, once the new structure was in operation with the expanded services anticipated and enlarged staff needed, would increase to at least $130,000 a year.

Upon the recommendation of Executive Director Ashmore, the Executive Committee revised the 1960-61 budget downward to $84,692. Changes in reporting income from the 1960 convention alone accounted for $8,745 of the decrease. To save expenses without a severe effect on services, the committee decided to reduce the length of the annual Development Institute from ten days to seven while boosting the fee from $175 to $200 or $225, and to combine two issues of *Pride*.[2] However, additional expenditures for 1960-61 loomed because the national office needed to add an assistant director and another secretary. Moreover, the Association still owed a considerable sum to attorneys who had assisted in obtaining ACPRA's tax-exempt status. Legal fees of just over $2,500 for this assistance had been paid to date.[3]

The Executive Committee believed that the member colleges and universities should bear the increased basic operating costs of the Association. At its New York meeting it passed a resolution of wide interest: "That since the satisfaction of financial requirements of our colleges and universities is of paramount importance to the survival of the American educational enterprise as the foundation of our national vigor, and since this Association must proceed immediately to provide urgently needed services to assist in the planning, organization, and conduct of effective programs that will advance the understanding and support of higher education, the Executive Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees of the reorganized Association the adoption of a new membership fee schedule as of August 1, 1961, that will produce an additional $40,000 a year in revenue from member institutions."[4] Under the new bylaws, the Board of Trustees had to authorize any new fee schedule.

In March, districts and councils of the Association elected by mail ballot the individuals who would represent them on the Board of Trustees when the organization began functioning under its new structure on August 1. The present Executive Committee decided to hold a joint meeting with members of the board for the year ahead to assure a smooth transition to the new functional organization. Because such a meeting promised to be expensive, the officers sought and received a special grant of $5,000 from the Ford Foundation. The joint meeting was held in Dearborn, Michigan, April 16-18, with twenty-three individuals—nine members of the Executive Committee and sixteen members of the 1961-62 board, two of whom also held membership on the Executive Committee—in attendance. The only woman in the group was Frances Riche of Douglass College (Rutgers University), representing the Middle Atlantic District.[5]

The Executive Committee presented five different membership fee schedules for consideration. Each plan proposed that dues be assessed in accordance with enrollment as reported in the *Higher Education Directory* of the U. S. Office of Education in the issue preceding the date of billing. The trustees finally settled on a plan, quite similar to that suggested by the Study Commission, which called for enrollment categories, the amount of dues, and the number of representatives included for the fee to be as follow: enrollment 0-299, dues $50, one representative; 300-999, $100, two representatives; 1,000-4,999, $125, three representatives; 5,000 and over, $150, four representatives. Dues for educational associations were set at $100, with each agency entitled to two representatives. Both educational institutions and agencies could enroll additional representatives for a fee of $15 each. Although the new schedule was approved at this time, its ratification was postponed until the Board of Trustees for 1961-62 met in connection with the annual convention in Denver, seven weeks later. For the benefit of institutions which might have difficulty meeting the dues increase because they had adopted their 1961-62 budgets before the new schedule was announced, the trustees authorized a method of waivers to be followed at the discretion of the executive vice president.[6]

Housekeeping items, reports, elections, and planning for the 1961 convention occupied much of the three days in Dearborn. One of the reports greeted with enthusiasm came from Leo Geier, vice president for districts and membership, who announced that the total number of member representatives had already reached a new high of 1,697, from 876 member institutions and fifty-one educational associations.[7] By the time the fiscal year ended the total of member representatives had climbed to 1,717 and the number of member institutions to 881.[8]

Ashmore announced that the fund-raising program was progressing with $11,250 in hand, including a $10,000 grant made by the United States Steel Foundation. A $15,000 foundation grant was also virtually assured, he reported.[9]

Elections to complete the roster of officers, the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees for 1961-62 was a major item of business for the Dearborn meeting. H. Russell Bintzer of Carnegie Institute of Technology, the current vice president for publications and Association services, was named president-elect and Robert E. Nelson of the University of Kansas City, was elected secretary-treasurer. Named as the three trustees who would serve on the Executive Committee with the president, president-elect, past president, secretary-treasurer, and executive vice president were Horace W. Hewlett, Amherst College; W. Noel Johnston, Ohio Wesleyan University, and Dyar Massey, Emory University. Everett H. Hopkins, who had moved from Washington University to become vice president for university advancement at

Duke, and James H. Denison of Michigan State University were elected as trustees-at-large to complete the Association's first Board of Trustees.

Although the new name for the Association proposed by the Study Commission had been turned down as too long and unwieldy, the search for a new name was continued by a committee of seven appointed by President Lyle Nelson. The chairman, Russell Bintzer, now announced that the committee would meet in Pittsburgh on May 4 to consider the suggestions being received from members and other sources. Working with Bintzer on the committee were the Reverend Arthur L. Dussault, S. J., Gonzaga University; Frances Riche, Douglass College; Patrick Nicholson, University of Houston; Denison, and two past presidents, W. Emerson Reck, Wittenberg University, and Marvin G. Osborn, Jr., Washington University.[10]

In preparation for their meeting, members of the Committee on Name Change studied the history of the Association and the report of the Study Commission. They determined that 516 different titles were held by members of ACPRA and tried to choose the most appropriate names among fifty-five assembled from a variety of sources. As a result of these studies, the committee came to two conclusions early in its Pittsburgh meeting: that it would be impossible to find a name that fairly described all the duties or functions of the individual representatives, and that it should strive to find a name that would suggest the purpose and/or philosophy of the Association. Next the committee agreed on two general principles: that the suggested name would have to be an "umbrella" one, and that it would have to be the best compromise that could be devised.

The committee then set five criteria as its measure of a satisfactory name: (1) even though the name would be new, it should incorporate some visual and auditory relationship to previous names; (2) it should suggest the Association's purpose; (3) it should avoid the use of any word currently in frequent use in the titles of people in the Association; (4) it should include the word "advancement"; and (5) it should reflect membership by institutions rather than by individuals.

After hours of discussion, the committee decided unanimously to recommend adoption of the name "American Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities." The rationale for this name was based on the fact that it: (1) contained three of the words incorporated in every name of the Association since 1917—American, Association, and Colleges; (2) seemed clearly to suggest purpose; (3) avoided the use of any frequently appearing words in representative titles studied; (4) included the word "advancement"; and (5) clearly stated that the Association served colleges and universities. The committee urged that a full report of its deliberations be made promptly to all member representatives to afford sufficient time and reflection before the Denver convention, at which the change could be approved by a two-thirds vote of the members present.

During a conference held by the Executive Committee on May 24, Bintzer reviewed in detail the manner in which his committee had arrived at its recommendations. No action was taken that day but the Executive Committee, in session three days before the convention opened in Denver, approved the Bintzer committee's report and recommended to the Board of Directors that the proposed new name, American Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities, "be promptly submitted to the membership for action at this convention."[11]

The Board of Directors, holding its swansong meeting early on the morning of July 5, voted that the proposed new name should be submitted to the members with a recommendation for approval when the annual business meeting was held later that day.

A heated discussion took place at the business meeting, after which the delegates voted to table the recommendation. They then voted that the Executive Committee restudy the subject of a new name and report to the membership as soon as possible so that a recommendation could be submitted for action at the 1962 convention.[12]

In addition to its action on the name change, the Executive Committee on June 29 determined the place and time for the

1963 convention and received good news concerning the Association's finances and the approaching convention. Chicago was selected as the site for the 1963 convention on June 23-27. More than 700 registrations were in hand for the four-day meeting scheduled to open on July 2.[13] And Ashmore reported that income for the first ten months had climbed to $90,914, while expenses had been $75,304. In projecting the financial picture, he saw the year's income exceeding $108,000 and expenses approximating $81,500.

Equally encouraging was the report that members of the Executive Committee had secured over $30,000 from companies and foundations since the Association gained tax-exempt status as of August 1, 1960. All of these funds were restricted "to defray the unusual costs involved in the Association's reorganization and in greatest part to underwrite projects . . . being planned to make possible an immediate increase in programs and services available to the general membership."

Without these grants, the Executive Committee noted, the Association could not have expected to balance its budget for the current year. This realization led the committee to emphasize the need for the Board of Trustees for 1961-62 to approve the new dues schedule recommended at the Dearborn meeting in April. "It will," the minutes read, "enhance the Association's chances of attracting substantial support from foundations and corporations for the new projects presently planned to be undertaken as soon as possible." During their extensive travels in search of financial support, members of the committee had discovered that applications for grants to defray operating expenses would not be greeted favorably by prospective donors. On the other hand, it appeared that requests for support in developing projects, particularly of the nonrecurring or eventually self-sustaining type, would be welcomed.

ACPRA at this time still owed $3,380 to attorneys who assisted in obtaining its tax-exempt status. The Executive Committee voted "that payments . . . not exceed the Association's present commitments, that $1,045 be paid in June of 1961 and 1962, and that the timing of payment of the remaining balance of $1,290 due be determined by the incoming Executive Committee."[14] Total legal fees for this assistance would consequently be $5,900.

The need for a smooth transition to operations under the Association's reorganized structure had led the new Board of Trustees to schedule a meeting before the Denver convention, and the Executive Committee for 1961-62 to hold meetings during and immediately after the convention. By voting to approve the minutes of the meeting held jointly with the Executive Committee in Dearborn April 17-18, the trustees ratified the election of officers and trustees-at-large held at that meeting and also the adoption of the new dues schedule.

One of the more important decisions made by the trustees led to a change in the publications program of the Association. A task force headed by Bintzer had made a careful study of present publications. It came to the conclusion that publications should serve all interests represented by the membership, should be timely, should generously provide practical "how-to" information, and should contain a reasonable amount of scholarly, philosophical-type material. The committee held that no one publication could adequately meet all these requirements. It therefore recommended that publication of *Pride* be suspended and that in its place ACPRA establish two publications, one an informational newsletter, the other "a prestige quarterly that would allow the treatment of appropriate subjects in depth."

Procurement of gifts and grants was anticipated as a major job in the future, and the appointment of a five-man Finance Committee was announced at the trustees' meeting. Headed by Robert E. Nelson, the new secretary-treasurer, this group included James W. Jackson, Jr., director of the sustaining associates program at Washington University; Robert L. Gale, vice president for public relations and development at Carleton College; Thomas P. Nickell, Jr., vice president of university planning at the University of Southern California, and Bintzer. One of its chief tasks would be the procurement of gift support for special projects of the Association.

The new bylaws scheduled to become effective August 1 called for councils on public relations, financial support, and management, each with a membership of nine, to replace the Communications, Development and Management Sections of the old structure, in each case with enlarged programs for members of ACPRA interested in these special areas. As indicated earlier, the membership had selected the councils by mail vote in March. The chairmen of the councils—Leo Geier, public relations; James Jordan, management; and Gale, financial support—now made their first reports to the trustees, covering preliminary organizational plans.[15]

No steps had yet been taken to organize the Board of Advisers and the commissions authorized by the new bylaws. The Board of Advisers, the bylaws said, should consist "of twelve eminent persons from such fields as education, business and industry, labor, government, the professions, and civic and philanthropic enterprises, to serve in an advisory and consultative relationship to the Board of Trustees and officers."[16]

Ashmore, chairman of a special task force on the formation of the Board of Advisers, told the trustees that such a board promised to be of importance for four reasons: "(1) the growing interest in ACPRA on the part of other organizations in our field and the need to communicate with them; (2) the need for ACPRA to advance higher education in general and the need for ACPRA to have a better platform from which to do this; (3) the need to interpret ACPRA throughout higher education; (4) the need of ACPRA to secure financial support." To permit establishment of the Board of Advisers by early fall, the trustees were asked to nominate men for the board immediately following the convention.[17]

The new bylaws called for the Board of Trustees to establish any commissions needed "to serve the specialized needs of identifiable groups of member representatives." Each commission was to include from three to nine persons, each serving for a three-year term.[18] Because the new bylaws made no provision for the Medical Section, for nearly ten years an active group with a membership now approaching 200, the trustees voted to help it form a commission if it so desired. They also requested a task force under James Denison to establish by October 1 criteria and policy for the creation and operation of commissions.[19] The task forces headed by Ashmore and Denison were only two of nine which had been appointed cooperatively by President Nelson and Arthur Schaefer, who would become president August 1. The others, each charged with formulating plans meant to strengthen ACPRA in a specific area of activity, related to long-range goals, membership, districts, financing, research, institutes and workshops, and awards and competitions.[20]

Some of ACPRA's eleven districts had been charging dues for several years, a practice which the new Executive Committee abolished in its meeting held on July 4. As an interim financing program for districts through 1962-63, the committee voted to provide each district presently collecting dues an annual amount not to exceed the total of its current year's dues receipts, providing the district made a formal reques outlining its needs and indicating willingness to account to the national office fo expenditures made. Districts that had no been collecting dues, the committee decided, would be provided up to $100 for the development of their programs, provided they, too, made a written request.

Already looking forward to the 1962 convention scheduled for July at the Greenbrie in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia all members of the Executive Committe stayed over following the Denver convention for a meeting devoted largely to a cri tique of the conference just ended and plan for the one a year hence.[21]

Announcement of a change in leadership i the national office was made at Denver b President Nelson. Frank Ashmore, wh had served as executive director of ACPR for two years and was responsible for man of the advances made, had resigned in Apri to accept the post of assistant vice presiden for development at Duke University. Jame W. Jackson, Jr., director of the sustainin associates program at Washington Univer sity, would be his successor. He would bea the title of executive vice president authorized by the revised bylaws.[22]

The theme for the Denver convention held July 2-6 was "Integrity in the Sixties." The program indeed lived up to its advance billing as "an encyclopedia of college and university public relations and development covering virtually every timely and important subject in the areas of management, communications, development, specialized public relations, and general institutional problems." In addition to the general sessions, there were special programs for different types of institutions; a series of lectures, panels, and discussions for members of the Administration, Communications, Development, and Medical Sections; and two ninety-minute sessions during which thirty tables, each manned by three or four "experts," tackled thirty basic areas within the fields of management, fund raising, and communications. The convention marked the first time special programs had been held on a large scale for eleven types of institution: women's colleges, technological institutions, regional state colleges and universities, land-grant colleges and universities, junior colleges, urban universities, separated state universities, Protestant church-related colleges, Catholic institutions, private universities, and medical schools.[23] More than eighty sessions involving 303 participants were held during the convention, and selected papers from the convention were later published.[24]

With 956 persons registered, attendance at the Denver convention set a new record.[25] Many of these individuals were visiting Colorado for the first time, so the conference planners, headed by Victor Danilov of the University of Colorado, consequently decided that the afternoon and evening of July 4 should be spent on a tour through the mountains to famed Central City and Boulder. At the former, reached via spectacular canyons and tunnels hewn from granite, the group had opportunity to see *La Traviata* featuring stars from the Metropolitan Opera Company. They could also take pictures, tour fascinating gift shops, and take a jeep ride to one of the deserted mines nearby. En route to Boulder, where the university was host at a steak fry and fireworks show with group singing added for good measure, the convention buses climbed near the timberline for a vast panorama of snow-capped peaks to the west and a magnificent view of the wide plains to the east.[26]

At the conference dinner the following evening the Association conferred two awards for distinguished service to higher education, one to Frank H. Sparks, president of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, "for his pioneering efforts to obtain corporate support for higher education . . ." and the other to the Des Moines *Register* and the Des Moines *Tribune* "for exemplary concern for higher education . . ." Tom W. Van Arsdale, Jr., chairman of the Study Commission, received one of two awards made for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education, his citation reading: "For thoughtful, far-sighted leadership to this Association during a crucial period in its history, and for his consistent influence in making the advancement of understanding and support of higher education the paramount objective of this Association. As a teacher and as an administrator he has demonstrated a consistent competence which stands as a notable example for others to emulate."

The other award for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education went to the Reverend Arthur J. Dussault, S. J., director of public relations and development at Gonzaga University and a leader in the Association for more than fifteen years. His citation read: "For integrity, for effective leadership in this Association and for outstanding performance of duty at Gonzaga University. His unwavering devotion to high objectives, and his continuous adherence to exacting standards of performance have made him a symbol of the personal integrity and professional competence to which we all aspire."

Fifty-eight awards were presented to member institutions in the National Honors Competition, thirty of them in the field of publications. Others were made for educational news and features, audio-visual media, and general public relations or development projects.[27]

While the Executive Committees, old and new, the Board of Directors for 1960-61, and the Board of Trustees for 1961-62 were concentrating on preparations for reorganization, the national office continued during 1960-61 to furnish the services provided in past years and in some cases enlarged upon them. Popularity of the FYI folders introduced in 1959-60 by reprinting materials from *Pride* and *College Public Relations Quarterly* led to the printing of eight additional folders, each of which could be borrowed from the national office for one or two weeks. Five of the folders, titled "Special Events Publications," "Development Brochures," "Internal Relations Publications and Institutional Magazines," "Student Recruitment Materials," and "Catalogs," were organized from the prize-winning publications in the 1960 National Honors Competition. Other additions to the FYI Library were "Newsletter Writing and Publishing," "Governance of Colleges and Universities," and a report on a special study, "Public Higher Education and Voluntary Support," issued by G. A. Brakeley, Inc.[28]

After a year of planning, ACPRA in March, 1961, announced a limited pilot program for on-the-job training for "freshman" college development officers. This was the third step ACPRA had taken in the field of college development work. The first was the establishment of the annual summer institute, the third of which was held at Colorado College immediately after the Denver convention. The second had been the founding of the Association's Consulting Service, which offered aid in all areas of public relations and development.

Fifteen institutional members of ACPRA had agreed to participate in the new internship program. Only individuals already engaged in development work or ones newly and specifically employed for development work in a member institution of ACPRA would be eligible to participate in the four-week program.[29]

Action which would help ACPRA broaden its research program currently and in the years ahead was taken in March. At that time, five prominent behavioral scientists accepted invitations to become charter members of the Association's Research Advisory Committee. The five, who would work closely with the Association's six-man Research Committee headed at that time by William P. Ehling, director of information services at Syracuse University, were Paul Deutschmann, chairman of the Communications Research Center, Michigan State University; Richard F. Carter, Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University; John K. Folger, associate director for research, Southern Regional Education Board; George G. Stern, Psychological Research Center, Syracuse University; and David Manning White, professor of journalism, School of Pubic Relations and Communications, Boston University.[30] After the Research Advisory Committee held its first meeting with ACPRA's Research Committee March 23-24, Ashmore reported in his "Headquarters Highlights" that work had begun on an instrument to measure factors which influence giving, and on an introduction to statistics for public relations practitioners. Carter was directing the former project, White the latter.[31]

With Susan Hanna serving as acting edito following George Doty's departure, *Pride*, now in its final year of publication, provided members of 1960-61 with the mos varied and helpful articles of its five-yea history. One of the articles was a thought-provoking piece, "The Man in the Corner" by Arthur J. Schaefer, vice president fo public relations and development at DePaul University and ACPRA's president-elect.[32]

"Public relations a quarter-century ago wa largely a matter of getting the institutiona name into print, particularly in the metropolitan papers," Schaefer said in his article "His successor today, in contrast, is referred to whenever anyone, from the president down, is doubtful about who shoul handle a problem."

Schaefer then listed some of the many concerns of the public relations director: th imperious secretary who must know "Wh is calling, please?" before an outsider ca speak to her boss; the style and tone o administrative letters; the institution's letterheads mostly for the sake of appearance but for economy as well; the artistic qualit of the placards in window cases; the qualit of internal relations; the manner in whic new faculty members are welcomed.

"The public relations director," Schaefer declared, "works with the president to keep the board of trustees well informed and active on their committee assignments. He reminds administrators of milestones in careers being reached by loyal staff members and suggests suitable observances. He sponsors formation of volunteer groups to accomplish special institutional objectives. He drafts appropriate citations which are intoned at commencements and convocations. He counsels concerning persons on whom the university should place the mantle and hood symbolic of an honorary degree. . . .

"By and large, the illustrations that have been presented are those a public relations officer can accomplish when he is alert and sensitive to needs that exist, and tactful and diplomatic in his method of taking care of them. These, for the most part, involve matters that are being done well or poorly—but being done, on any campus. People answer telephones. They write letters. They talk to community groups. The problem for the public relations director is to see that the telephones are well answered, the letters effectively and courteously written, the speeches made by the right people. . . .

"Public relations is more than communicating. . . . It is the public relations function, it seems to me, to point out to the institution, 'This routine academic activity of ours does not highlight our basic worth. We must devise something special, something new, that will focus public attention upon this worthwhile quality that we have'. . . .

"Public relations in our colleges and universities today," Schaefer concluded, "is no longer a small task with frustrating limitations but a challenging career that invites the most creative thinking and long-range vision a person can muster."

Travelling the length and breadth of the country, Francis C. Pray, former president of ACPRA who had become vice president for college relations for the Council for Financial Aid to Education, had spoken before 800 college administrators attending the President's Seminars sponsored by CFAE. Always his subject was "Troika," and his objective to make clear to his listeners the steps needed to assure a good functional and operational organization for an institutional support program. The paper, which had created widespread comment and requests for copies from ACPRA members, was finally printed as the lead article in the November, 1960, issue of *Pride*.[33] Reprints by the thousand were then made available to colleges, universities, and other interested organizations.

"There is nothing mystical about organization of a good institutional support program," Pray had told his audiences. "The principal tools are found in the administrative areas of public relations, fund raising, and alumni relations, hence 'Troika'—the three-horse team. These tools must be brought together into a systematic, persuasive, and persistent program in order to be of maximum use."

Pray told the presidents that there are seven steps in building a good program to win public understanding and support, then added: "These steps do *not* involve starting up with a lot of television and newspaper publicity programs. They do *not* involve firing off shotguns in all directions hoping to frighten to death some aging alumnus who you suspect has made a 'favorable' will. They *do* constitute a relatively quiet but systematic process involving a commitment by the whole institution."

Pray then enumerated the seven steps with considerable elaboration on each:

(1) Develop a clear, vigorous, and inspiring statement of the character and goals of the institution.

"In my experience," Pray declared, "the lack of a written statement of goals and a definition of policies has been the cause of more mistakes in administration, more wasted time in committee meetings, and more confusion in the development program than any other single factor I can think of."

(2) Invite and encourage every member of the institutional family—trustees, administration, faculty, students, and alumni—to participate freely and wholeheartedly in the accomplishment of the goals set forth for the institution.

"Nothing, literally nothing," Pray commented, "can be accomplished with a passive board of trustees, a divided faculty, an unwilling student body, an uncommitted administration, or a lackadaisical or obstructive alumni body. . . ."

(3) Undertake a searching analysis and a challenging written description of the needs which must be met to attain the goals and accomplish the mission.

". . . Every need, before it is entered on the list," Pray warned, "should be judged as to whether or not it contributes to the attainment of the goals decided upon by the institution. This constant 'referencing' will keep fat off your lists, prevent arguments as to priorities, and help you discourage capriciousness on the part of faculty, staff, and trustees alike as they push their own pet projects."

(4) Identify and analyze the means required and potentially available to attain the goals and accomplish the mission.

"Match against every need all obvious sources through which it may be met," Pray said. "And then carry on a careful investigation to uncover other possible sources. If you can't think of a single possible place where a need can be met, reexamine the need or put it on the shelf. . . . Build a file of information on each source, whether it be an individual, a group, a corporation, a church, a foundation, a legislative leader, or a large segment of the general public."

(5) After the potential sources have been identified and researched, write a prescription for a practical approach to each key person or group whose contribution of money, time, or influence is important.

"This," said Pray, "is the *project level operation*, perhaps the most important of all. Notice I said *write* a prescription. . . . Writing it out helps us to be objective, it helps us think what would appeal to the interest of the donor, it suggests we put a timetable to the steps to be accomplished. It serves as a spur to our action."

(6) Develop a coordinated, effective administrative organization and operating program to obtain the means to meet the needs to attain the goals.

"The support commitment begins at the top," Pray declared in beginning his elaboration on this point to which he devoted well over half of his 4,700-word paper. "After the board of trustees has accepted responsibilites for the total institutional support program and has registered commitment to it, special board committees should be organized to bring constant attention to the program. . . . Next an institution-wide council on institutional support should be organized, with representation from all major institutional groups. . . . It will give continuing advice and guidance to the program. It will provide a focus for information and 'psychological coordination'. . . . Next the president must organize his administrative staff as best he can to provide the kind of continuing direction and assistance which he will need if he is to have time to devote to his other functions as educational and business leader of the institution.

"Here, of course, we're beginning to talk about the elements of public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and the related operations,—the major operating level offices which will do the major part of the support job, under leadership and direction of the president. . . ."

At this point Pray discussed the need for coordination of the program and illustrated his points with charts showing functional relationships and the elements in an institutional support program.

(7) Undertake a continuous follow-up and analysis, a sort of rolling reevaluation, to improve performance, assess results, and modify goals or methods in the light of changing conditions.

"The institutions which are moving ahead have done two things," Pray concluded. "They have clearly defined aims; they have set themselves the rigorous job of building quality; they have defined the area where they can serve our society. In addition, they have committed the necessary *money, time, energy, imagination*, and *personnel* to the task of getting the support they need to meet their goals. . . .

"The gap between the best and the worst *is* growing wider. The public every year *is* growing more sophisticated. The public every year *is* better able to discriminate between quality and marginal institutions. Every year wasted, every month's delay in making your case for legislative support, or for private gift support or for church support, or for better understanding, is a year or a month that can never be recaptured."

The president of Boston University, the first American institution to establish a School of Public Relations, presented his views on the subject when he wrote on "The Deeper Issue of Public Relations" for a later issue of *Pride*.

"Today, when we talk of public relations and higher education," wrote Harold C. Case, "we are not speaking of extrasensory impressions, popularity polls, good sportsmanship, or size.

"We are setting forth the life-and-death issues of our culture, the mind's insights versus mere physical passions; the spiritual qualities in company of which we emerge as distinctive human beings; knowledge in depth for its own reward; skills for tasks that dignify personality; perspective to keep current on world issues and trends; and courage enough to take a stand for values that last beyond an Arctic storm or a moon month.

"I speak for the public relations officer who is an expert practitioner, possessing all the techniques and arts of his craft; but more, much more, he is a philosopher, thinker, and dedicated servant of the most hopeful enterprise ever designed for the fulfillment of mankind, *education*.

"He ceases to become a salesman and becomes an exponent. He is not interested in gadgets, but in greatness. He cannot be wooed by glib phrases because he is busy stating basic themes. I speak for much harder mental work, deeper research, greater insight, vastly better philosophy of education on the part of the people who are to tell the story of education.

"If you become these greater people, the theme will be well told. If it is well told, persons will invest money, time, intellect and will in the program."[34]

In 1960-61, the January-February issue of *Pride* brought to members the news that Harold Ellis, a pioneer in college public relations and the Association's president in 1942-43, had died during the Christmas holidays. Ellis, founder and for twenty-one years head of the state-wide public information program of the University of California, had been the program chairman for the Association's 1941 convention, first ever held in the Far West.[35]

ACPRA was fortunate to have Lyle Nelson as its president in the "Year of Preparation." Nelson's ready grin and penchant for lighthearted quips and practical jokes sometimes made new acquaintances wonder if he ever had a serious moment. On the job, however, he was a work horse and also inspired others to give full measure of their talents. Without his meticulous guidance, 1960-61 could have been a disaster, because of the administrative and financial hurdles posed by reorganization. When Nelson turned the reins of leadership over to Arthur Schaefer on August 1, the records not only showed steady progress toward the expanded program but also a financial base far stronger than ever before. Gifts and grants, with Nelson personally securing several of the larger ones, set a record ($30,760) which would not be equalled until the Association celebrated its fiftieth anniversary five years hence. Total income, as a result, had jumped nearly thirty-six percent—to $105,163 from $77,805 the year before. Meanwhile, a tight rein had been held on expenditures and the excess of income over expenses left the Association with a tidy balance of $24,894. Best of all, perhaps, assets and net worth of the Association had climbed fifty-three percent—to $50,512 from the $32,906 of the preceding year.[36]

'Year of Transition'

ACPRA had now come to its "Year of Transition." Its new structure would become operative under the Articles of Organization and bylaws, proposed at the end of Marvin Osborn's administration and ratified by the membership in December, 1960. The mechanics of transition governed the thinking of the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees all year, and when the 1962 convention was held at the Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, July 1-5, the theme was "The Challenge of Transition."[37]

In addressing district meetings during the year President Arthur Schaefer emphasized again and again "The New Frontier for ACPRA." "This is a fascinating organization," Schaefer told his listeners, "and part of its fascination is that it is ever-changing."

After tracing the Association's growth in services, presitge, and membership, Schaefer turned his attention to the future. He declared, "The more we get into the dynamics of the new organization, the clearer it be[illegible] that far more can and must be done to improve understanding and support of college and university advancement.

"If we are to be key workers in moving our institutions along the difficult road to prestige," the president continued, "we must acquire a richer and deeper grasp of our roles in higher education and greater competence in performance. If ACPRA is to be an instrument by which we reach this level of competence, several pedestrian fundamentals must first be accomplished.

"We must broaden and deepen the functions of our national office staff. . . . While accommodating our neophyte members . . . we must challenge the old members with new insights into their professional responsibilities. . . . We need more study and practice in making our new ACPRA machinery work. . . . We must take steps to attract new personnel with top qualifications for our work and we must set up effective programs for training them. . . . The touchstone of success in our kind of work is the desire to serve others."[38]

Schaefer was in a good position to speak out and to lead. An honor graduate of DePaul University in 1934, he taught English there before World War II. He emerged from the war as a naval lieutenant (senior grade) in charge of personnel training with the Bureau of Aeronautics, and was asked to set up a public relations department at DePaul. After directing the university's development program for three years, he was named vice president for public relations and development in 1955. Since 1956 he had been a member of ACPRA's board, for the most part as an officer, and had been a participant in the Greenbrier Conference of 1958.

At its meeting in Denver, the new Board of Trustees had set five priorities for 1961-62: preparation of "how-to" materials, support of district activities, support of the national meeting, support of institutes and workshops, and research. At a meeting in Chicago October 2 the Executive Committee set $131,032 as the year's budget to fulfill these plans. Of this, $33,917 was to be raised through gifts.

The Board of Trustees, meeting on the same day and the following, discussed long-range goals such as the sponsorship of institutes and workshops, adopted policies relative to commissions, and voted to refer the matter of a change in name to the Executive Committee. President John F. Kennedy had recently expressed a desire for counsel from public relations people concerning national policy and national affairs, and the trustees voted to inform him of ACPRA's desire to serve. They also voted to invite him to address the 1962 convention.[39]

After Everett Hopkins, chairman of the Task Force on Long-Range Goals, had discussed the philosophical and practical implications and needs of long-range planning, the trustees agreed that work of the task force could not be done with haste. They also agreed "that the Association should investigate the possibility of securing a grant for a three- to five-year study designed to create a 'blueprint' for the Association's future."

Basically, the new policy on commissions called for the trustees "to cause inquiries to be made as to the need for a commission or commissions to be established to carry out assignments in the interests of the Association" or "to consider, at any meeting, petitions signed by representatives of at least twenty-five members setting forth that a substantial number of members share a common need for service or information not being met, or being met inadequately, within the existing organizational structure of ACPRA." Commissions would be authorized to operate for a period not to exceed three years.[40] Although the trustees had anticipated that a number of petitions would be received urging the establishment of commissions, the year passed without the receipt of a single one.

With the budget set, ACPRA, through the national office, launched upon the most ambitious publishing program of its first fifty years. Expenditures for publications in 1960-61 had totaled $13,653 of which $11,395 went for the final six issues of *Pride*.[41] During 1961-62 the Association spent $50,813 for publications. Of this amount $8,994 was used to launch the replacement for *Pride*, called *College and University Journal*, and $7,052 to cover the expense of six issues of the new ACPRA *Newsletter*. Various other publications—all of them new except the *Membership Directory and Annual Reports*—made up the remaining $34,767 spent on publications during the year.[42]

The first publication to appear was the new ACPRA *Newsletter*, containing from sixteen to twenty-four pages about the activities of the national office, districts, commissions, committees; and individuals. The Placement Service launched formally by the Association ten years earlier had consumed time and money far out of proportion to results, and with the advent of the *Newsletter* the Executive Committee decided that placement efforts would henceforth be confined to classified advertising in the new publication. The September issue contained only six such advertisements occupying a quarter page. Space would be available, the publication announced, at the rate of twenty cents a word and a minimum of $5 per insertion. By the end of the year the *Newsletter* was carrying as many a thirty-nine such ads covering nearly two pages.[43]

The *College and University Journal*, edited by part-time staff member Richard W. Smith and "designed to stimulate thinking and interest in institutional relations and development as part of the higher educational process," made its initial appearance with the Winter, 1962, issue published in January. To emphasize its purpose the *Journal* carried the words, "Devoted to the Understanding and Advancement of Higher Education" on its cover. Beautifully done in every way, the *Journal* was "purposefully conservative in format, hopefully of appeal to higher education in general." Like its predecessor, *Pride*, it carried display advertising. Unlike *Pride*, it did not use pictures or color, and thus met with some criticism.

ACPRA introduced two additional periodicals for its members in 1961-62. One of these, edited by Dr. M. M. Chambers of the University of Michigan and titled *Grapevine*, provided information on legislation affecting higher education. It was sent without charge to those members requesting it. The other publication, *Federal Government Programs Newsletter*, was published to solve a temporary problem of information on federal government programs until the American Council on Education prepared its expanded program which would provide such information. Seven issues were published and offered optionally to the general membership at no cost, to nonmembers for $15.[44]

While providing four new periodicals for its members, ACPRA also kept up a constant flow of "how-to" materials. Included were reprints of two books which had been of special help to newcomers in the 1940s—*Public Relations for Colleges and Universities* by C. E. Persons, vice president of McCann-Erickson and a special consultant on public relations for western educational institutions, and *How to Use Letters in College Public Relations*, by W. H. Butterfield, chairman of the Department of Business Communication at the University of Oklahoma. The other "how-to" publications of the year were a 350-page *Reference Manual*, which included papers on all aspects of public relations, fund raising, and management of programs prepared by ninety-four participants in the panels forming the final day's sessions of the 1961 conference in Denver; three volumes on *Communications Techniques*, "freely adapted from a manual prepared for the Air University of the U. S. Air Force"; three volumes of *Development Institute Papers*, made up of papers presented at the 1959, 1960 and 1961 Summer Institutes for College Development Officers; *Selected Papers*, a ninety-four-page volume containing several papers delivered at the 1961 conference program in Denver; *Long-Range Planning for Colleges and Universities*, a report by H. L. Wilse of Booz, Allen and Hamilton on ways in which colleges and universities should plan their future; *The Big Gift*, a compilation of nine papers presented at a conference ACPRA sponsored in early November; *Federal Government Programs for Colleges and Universities*, a series of presentations by leaders in agencies with programs in support of higher education; and *Selected Bibliography on Public Relations and Development*.[45] This comprehensive library on the understanding and support of higher education was made available to members without charge but at a cost of $32,077 to the Association itself. The individual publications were sold to nonmembers for prices ranging from $2 each for the *Selective Bibliography* and *Long-Range Planning* to $10 each for the *Reference Manual* and the three-volume sets on *Communications Techniques and Development Institute Papers*. Receipts from the Association's various publications netted almost $11,000, a sum highly welcome during a year in which income, although considerably higher than the budget, still ran far behind expenditures.[46]

Closely allied to the publications program but undertaken as a separate project was the preparation of a kit of material with which institutions could support estate planning programs. Conceived by Frank Ashmore during his administration as executive director and approved by the Executive Committee during the Denver convention, the program was planned to provide a guide in estate planning for the development officer as well as basic literature for an institution's constituency. The cost for each participating institution was set a $1,000 for individualized materials for 500 projects, but even before sample materials had been produced, fifty institutions announced their intention to participate. All materials, including announcements for institutional publications, folders describing opportunities for deferred giving, and brochures for prospective givers, were approved by an advisory board of authorities on law, taxation, and publications.[47] The project cost the Association $51,555 during the year but netted a small profit with income of $54,700.[48]

Workshops, seminars, and institutes played a much enlarged role in ACPRA's program starting in 1961-62. Nine such programs, most of them sponsored by the new Councils on Public Relations and Financial Support, were held between October and July. Most popular was that on "The Big Gift," and those on federal government programs for colleges and universities. The workshop on "The Big Gift," held in Chicago on November 6, drew an attendance of 200, so much beyond expectations that the site had to be changed to accomodate the unexpectedly-large registration. The nine papers, presented on such subjects as "The Special Giver," "Use of Volunteers," "Follow-ups of Prospects," and "The Future Prospects of the Big Giver," later composed one of the "how to" publications printed by the Association.

Like the workshop on "The Big Gift," the one on "Federal Government Programs for Higher Education" held in Washington on November 20-21 created interest beyond expectations. The maximum registration of 200 was accommodated and sixty persons wishing to attend had to be turned away. As a result a second conference on the same subject was held in December and more than 150 college officials attended. Papers presented at these workshops furnished the content for another of the year's "how to" publications.

The first workshop of the year was held at Massachusetts Institute of Technology on October 20. Devoted to publications design, it drew twenty-seven participants from all areas of the country.[49]

Other workshops that year, all held with large registrations, included two on "Estate Planning and Deferred Giving," the first in February, the second in May; one on "Corporate Relations and Corporate Support" and one on "Mass Media and College Public Relations," both held early in May. The one on "Corporate Relations and Corporate Support" was co-sponsored by CFAE as one of ACPRA's cooperative projects of the year.[50]

Twice during the summer of 1962 ACPRA sponsored institutes for college and university development officers, the first in Pittsburgh in July, the second in Portland, Oregon, in August. They were a continuation of the program started in 1959, but this year the curriculum was expanded to include sessions on communications and public relations.[51]

Costs for workshops and the summer institute for ACPRA's first year of its expanded program totaled $33,790. All but the first workshop on estate planning and that on "The Big Gift" more than paid their way. Income from the workshops and the first institute equalled $42,739.[52] So important had these programs become in the eyes of the membership during 1961-62 that the Executive Committee authorized the creation of the position of director of educational programs. First person to hold the post with responsibility for the still larger workshop program planned for 1962-63 was Leo C. Muller, who came to ACPRA from the University of Buffalo where he had been assistant to the chancellor for planning and development.[53]

Appointment of Muller was one of the steps which grew from a study of ACPRA's organization and accounting procedures. The Executive Committee had engaged a Philadelphia firm, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, to perform the study early in the winter of 1962. The Association's steady growth in numbers and services had suggested that some of its routine procedures were no longer providing maximum efficiency and the Philadelphia firm was engaged to determine possibilities for improvement. In a report submitted in February it made a series of recommendations, most of which were implemented in the next five years and paved the way for the Association to open its second half century stronger in staff and services.

The report recommended the creation of an additional management position, subordinate to the executive vice president. The new assistant would be responsible primarily for all internal operations of the national office, leaving the executive vice president free to innovate and implement programs for advancing services of the organization. The latter would, however, have primary responsibility for the preparation of the annual budget and for the establishment of basic internal operating policies.

The report also recommended that part-time help, such as that now used for stenographer and some editorial work, be replaced with full-time help as soon as possible. In addition, it recommended that the administrative personnel include four subordinates—a bookkeeper, a receptionist, a stenographer, and, eventually, a librarian. Recommendations also covered improved ways of keeping membership records and accounting and billing procedures. Most important of these, implemented in 1965, was that calling for billings for dues, now payable on the anniversary of the institution's membership, to be made instead at the beginning of the Association's fiscal year. This procedure, said the firm, would improve the Association's cash position early in the year and make budget and program planning more flexible; provide a sounder follow-up on delinquent payments; improve clerical efficiency, and enhance public relations. The report also provided improved billing and membership forms, and suggested that office space now divided between two floors was inadequate and conducive to poor internal communications.[54]

Programs of the Association's eleven districts received closer scrutiny during 1961-62 with the conclusion that they "should be strengthened and that they can be so strengthened only through active leadership through the national organization." With districts no longer permitted to charge dues under the new bylaws, district activities for 1961-62 had cost the national office $4,535.[55] District activities, as in the past, had been aimed at providing information through newsletters and an annual meeting and at helping members solve problems peculiar to their geographical region. To help district officers, all of them volunteers, carry out their duties with greater efficiency, a District Officers Conference somewhat similar to that held informally in 1960 was planned for July 1 in connection with the Association convention at the Greenbrier.[56] Meanwhile, approximately half of each issue of the *Newsletter* was devoted to activities of the districts and their members.

In his report to the trustees at their meeting preceding the convention, Executive Vice President Jackson indicated that district activities had been handicapped in 1961-62 by lack of funds and lack of agreement on responsibilities, communication, and authority among the various arms of the Association—trustees, councils, districts, and national office.

Later in the meeting, the trustees voted to establish a "reserve bank" of $1,1[illegible]0 as an emergency fund for districts. To be eligible for a grant of not more than $200 from the "reserve bank," a district would have to file its budget and activities schedule for the year with the national office within sixty days following the beginning of the fiscal year on August 1. Requests for emergency grants would also have to include a comprehensive statement of the circumstances which had created the emergency and how the grant would be used, if received. Grants would be made only upon the approval of the Association's Executive Committee.

At the first meeting of the Board of Trustees for 1962-63, held June 30, 1962, President-elect Bintzer authorized the revision of the *District Director's Manual* and announced that a committee would be named shortly to consider the wisdom of revising district boundaries.[57]

With membership climbing rapidly, the financial picture appeared rosy when the Executive Committee held a one-day meeting in Washington on December 11. Consequently, it adopted a series of recommendations which promised to push the budget considerably higher than the figure adopted in October. Among the items authorized were $5,000 for the development of a personnel training program for the Association; $4,500 for a spring meeting of the 1961-62 and 1962-63 Boards of Trustees and the 1962-63 district officers; $1,500 for a second publication of materials covering the workshop on federal government programs; $2,500 for the annual award and honors competitions and $2,000 for additional secretarial help. It also authorized Jackson to seek the services of a permanent assistant with no stated amount for salary.[58] At the same time it authorized him to seek foundation support for a lending library and the Council for Financial Aid to Education Seminars. Plans for a spring meeting of the 1961-62 and 1962-63 Boards of Trustees were later abandoned and the district officers meeting was held July 1 as planned earlier.

Appearance of the Association's new magazine, *College and University Journal*, in January, 1962, won acclaim from sister organizations and magazine publishers as well as members because it matched in appearance and quality of content the better periodicals then available in libraries and on the news stands. Among its authors for the three issues appearing during the 1961-62 fiscal year were Harold W. Dodds, president emeritus of Princeton University; William P. Tolley, chancellor of Syracuse University; Robert J. Bernard, president of Claremont College; Terry Sanford, chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers; Paul H. Davis, college consultant, and Homer Babbidge, vice president of ACE, who had also been a contributor to *Pride*. The new magazine achieved additional status through its book review section of five or six pages which covered, with nonmember critics in many cases, from four to seven books in each issue. After the first issue, the magazine also devoted as many as fifteen of its sixty-four pages to book digests, those for the spring and summer issues being William B. Benton's *The University of Chicago's Public Relations* and Seymour E. Harris' *Higher Education: Resources and Finance*.

The lead article for the first issue of the *Journal* was "A Philosophy of Institutional Advancement" by Everett H. Hopkins, chairman of the Study Committee whose work culminated in the Greenbrier Conference of 1958.[59]

"The over-riding question that has to be answered by each institution [in seeking advancement]," wrote Hopkins, now vice president for institutional advancement at Duke University, "is this: 'What all should, or can, happen within a college or university to advance as rapidly as possible its over-all pursuit of excellence?' . . . It seems clear to me that neither a development program organizationally detached from the academic program, nor one oriented solely to the separate units of the institution rather than the whole, can possibly be as conducive to total institutional advancement as one which functions within the context of the total academic program, thereby permeating the entire institution. . . .

"This point of view assumes the broadest meaning of the phrase *institutional advancement*. In briefest terms, it means the strengthening of all those forces that make a university great. It means strengthening the faculty; it means improving the quality of the student body, which in turn means improving the processes and criteria of admissions and selection; it means continuous internal self-study and self-evaluation in relation specifically to predetermined institutional objectives; it means providing for optimum growth in brick and mortar; it means more effective research and the improvement of instruction, regardless of how good it is at the moment; it means experimentation and evaluation of factors affecting the learning processes, e.g., programs of independent study, the use and encouragement of master teachers for large classes and teaching interns as assistants; and it means *substantial advancement* in public understanding and support of the university. In short, it means a constant striving for excellence in every phase of the university's life. It is therefore immediately clear that the institutional advancement office, if this is what it happens to be called, is not even remotely *in charge of* university-wide advancement, even though such advancement is its chief concern and its only reason for being. The special role of the advancement office is to advance the public and alumni understanding of the university, to provide the professional leadership and specific programs necessary to increase substantially the institution's financial resources, *and* to provide various kinds of assistance for those who are more directly and more fully engaged in the educational program, i.e., those who are much more responsible for the actual advancement processes.

"Under this arrangement," Hopkins continued, "the chief advancement officer serves in both a 'line' and a 'staff' capacity. He is a 'line' officer, in charge of specific programs in public relations, alumni affairs, and fund raising, but in other areas of institutional advancement he is a 'staff' officer, specifically an 'assistant to'. In this latter capacity, he has the opportunity and the responsibility to concern himself with *all* aspects of institutional advancement, but only as the helper, not the person in charge. In his 'line' capacity as the officer in charge of the professional development program, he would normally have strong department chairmen in the areas of public relations, alumni affairs, and fund raising; but, instead of building up large centralized professional staffs, these department chairmen would encourage as much decentralization as possible of their activities by enlisting the wholehearted participation of the deans, academic department chairmen, and faculties. . . .

"To implement this philosophy further, a committee structure [for institutional advancement] is suggested. At the policy level, there should be a trustee committee on institutional advancement. At the central administrative level, there should be a strong institutional committee (consisting of *all* the central administrative officers and an equivalent number of carefully selected members of the faculty), with advisory functions covering not only the areas of public relations, alumni affairs, and fund raising but also long-range planning, institutional studies, and other means of promoting and furthering institutional advancement. . . .

"With precise administrative definitions at every level, resulting in a deliberate meshing of administrative relationships and providing at the same time a built-in internal communications system brought about by widespread participation of all segments of the university family in some such manner as herein proposed, the development activities become intimately involved in the attainment of educational objectives, and the academic administrators and their faculties become genuine partners in the development program. Most of all, the development program becomes an integral and inseparable part of the overall program of institutional advancement. There may be many ways of accomplishing this kind of on-campus partnership, but it is the potential effectiveness and viability of the partnership that is the essence of the institutional advancement philosophy that I wish to suggest."

In addition to continuing cooperative efforts which had now become routine with other organizations in the educational field, ACPRA in 1961-62 joined with the Mead Paper Company in sponsoring a nationwide competition and New York City display of college and university publications. Outstanding entries in all categories of publications and from all types of institutions were cited and displayed in Mead's Library of Ideas on New York's Park Avenue.[60] The competition for the New York display did not replace ACPRA's own annual Honors Competition, but the winning pieces from forty-four institutions made up a special display on exhibit during the Greenbrier convention.

The Honors Competition drew approximately 200 entries for display and decision at the annual convention (henceforth to be known consistently as the annual conference). Judging for the first time was done by an outside firm and forty-five entries covering the broad areas of management, public relations, and financial support received citations for special merit. All entries were later made available to members through the Association's Lending Library.[61]

Research was the fifth among the Association's five priorities the Board of Trustees had set up for 1961-62. A committee was established which recommended such steps as inclusion of a research session in the national conference program; closer relationships and liaison with the public and agencies sponsoring research; closer ties with other educational associations interested in seeing the expansion of research in higher education; and workshops or conferences at which persons of experience would discuss problems in conducting research activities helpful to decision making within the administrative areas of higher education.[62]

The Greenbrier conference on July 1-5 was planned to give those attending the most comprehensive program, with the largest number of nationally known speakers, ever sponsored by the Association. After hearing a progress report by Westley Rowland of Michigan State, chairman for the convention, the Executive Committee in December had budgeted $27,850 for the annual meeting. Expenses for the 1961 convention had totaled $19,905.[63]

The star-studded speakers list included Elvis Stahr, secretary of the Army about to become president of Indiana University; Mark Hatfield, governor of Oregon, and Charles A. Malik, the former representative of Lebanon to the United Nations and president of the UN General Assembly. Three hundred volunteer workers served on various committees and as speakers, panelists, recorders, and evaluators for the convention. More than 200 papers were presented during the five days. The convention drew more than 850 persons, about 700 of them members of the Association and affiliates.[64] When all expenses for the national meeting were finally in hand it was found that they totaled $15,783, scarcely half the budgeted amount.[65]

The program undertaken by ACPRA in 1961-62 was the most comprehensive in its forty-five year history, a fact partially indicated by the huge increase—$37,160—made in expenditures for publications alone. With the large increase in services it was only natural that other expenditures would have to grow and they did—those in salaries and secretarial services, for instance, by more than $19,000 and those for postage by some 352 percent to $6,821.[66]

The much expanded program received credit for the great surge in member representatives the Association enjoyed. The final tally for 1961-62 was 2,418, representing an increase of more than forty percent over 1960-61. The new bylaws, which encouraged many institutions to add member representatives under the revised dues schedule, accounted for much of the increase.[67]

The one big disappointment for ACPRA officers in 1961-62 was the failure of gifts and grants to materialize as anticipated. Instead of the $33,197 budgeted, gifts received during the year totaled only $15,950. Of this amount $10,000 came from the United States Steel Foundation, the second grant of this size it had made in two years. Despite the failure of gifts to reach the sum anticipated, income for the year was much greater than that received in previous years, $139,377, or nearly $8,350 over budget. The enlarged program, however, had also pushed total expenses to a new high of $155,373 making it necessary to dip into the previous year's surplus.[68]

Consideration of a change of name for the Association continued to take considerable time in the Executive Committee in 1961-62. When the Board of Trustees met in October, 1961, an informal inquiry of each member by President Schaefer revealed that all but one of the twenty present favored a name change.[69] At a meeting in March, 1962, the Executive Committee "reconfirmed its conviction that the name ACPRA (a) does not reflect the true nature of the Association and (b) is a financial liability." The committee also voted to send, prior to the Greenbrier conference, a letter to all members of the Association "delineating all sides of all issues regarding a name change, announcing the Executive Committee's proposal for a name change, announcing that a discussion of the name change issue will be held at the annual meeting, and announcing that a vote on the name change will be taken by mail ballot subsequent to the annual meeting."[70]

Following the March meeting, the Executive Committee had determined that the name "Association for College and University Advancement" was the best that could be proposed. During a conference call on May 17, however, the committee decided that "while this name would have near-unanimous or unanimous endorsement of the Executive Committee, it may not be acceptable to a considerable segment of the membership . . . and the best interests of the Association may not be served by seeking adoption now. A compromise name, College Relations and Develpment Association, while more likely to find acceptance among all groups within the Association, does not engender enough enthusiasm among Executive Committee members to recommend its presentation by the Board of Trustees." Consequently, it was suggested that "the problem of the Association name should continue to be studied with a view to its resolution when appropriate." And so the matter of name change was carried over for still another year.[71]

Early in 1962 President Schaefer requested Patrick Nicholson of the University of Houston to make a thorough study of the present relationships among the Board of Trustees, councils, districts, and national headquarters of ACPRA, then make any recommendations deemed appropriate for improvements. After careful study of major documents and reports of recent years, including the Articles of Organization and bylaws, Nicholson produced a fourteen-page report concluded by four recommendations: "(1) revise the organization chart to make the councils directly responsible to the executive vice president instead of to the Association; (2) specify an exact programming procedure to be followed by the districts, councils, and national headquarters elements; (3) appoint a task force to report back to the 1963 annual conference with results of an inquiry into (a) possible need for specific qualifications for memberships in the councils, (b) results voted in 1962 programming at the district level with any recommendations for further change, and (c) any other areas of study believed to require action; and (4) appoint another task force to examine the feasibility of setting a definite time schedule under which action could be taken toward a goal of separate headquarters staff men for each council area, beginning even with one such man assisting all councils."[72]

When the Board of Trustees for 1962-63 held its first meeting just prior to the annual conference at White Sulphur Springs, it agreed that recommendations of the Nicholson report should be tried during the year. Bylaw changes would be suggested if the new procedures worked satisfactorily.[73]

The board's membership was now complete after elections held by the districts and councils during the year. At this meeting, Russell Bintzer was advanced to the presidency, Horace W. Hewlett of Amherst College named president-elect, and Dyar Massey of Emory University elected secretary-treasurer. The Executive Committee, which also included the past president and the executive vice president, the latter *ex officio*, was completed with the election of James H. Denison, Michigan State; Robert J. McCartney, University of Maryland; and Robert E. Nelson, now of Illinois Institute of Technology, from the trustees.

In 1962, for the third time since 1941, the Association conferred no award for outstanding achievement in public relations for higher education. Two awards for distinguished service to higher education were presented at the Greenbrier conference, one to Sebastian Kresge, president of the Kresge Foundation, the other to Colgate Darden, former congressman and governor of Virginia and more recently president of the University of Virginia.[74] A special citation also went to E. Ross Bartley of Indiana University, president of ACPRA in 1949-50.

Art Schaefer completed his year as ACPRA president by giving an address called "The Challenge of Transition" at the Greenbrier conference. Answering the question, "What can we do to help solve the problems of higher education in this day, to insure that its values will be preserved and strengthened as far ahead as the year 2000?" he said: "For one thing we must get into the mainstream of American higher education. If we have viewed ourselves in the past as service desks linking the educational institutions with the mass media, facilitating the flow of news and information, such a definition of our responsibility no longer holds. Some of us may now be employed in precisely such tasks. But unless we see ourselves in the larger context of educational planning and development, of understanding and support, we cannot perform even these tasks intelligently.

"Getting into the mainstream of American higher education means that we must become educators ourselves. If our colleagues in the intellectual disciplines become ever more specialized, we must become more generalized in our understanding of the nature and purpose of higher education and the goals of the institutions we serve. If our professional colleagues are increasingly concerned with turning out better accountants and physicists, we must become increasingly concerned with turning out more educated men.

"I think we are here to preserve the individuality of our institutions. There must be nothing but pity for those who come to a meeting like this and learn nothing. What they are looking for is something to copy, something to multiply without variety, something to contribute to an enveloping sameness among institutions. What are here and should be taken away are the healthy germs of ideas that will nourish and grow in fertile minds and develop uniquely on campuses where their appropriateness is recognized.

"If American higher education faces a great challenge today, a heavy part of that challenge rests upon us who are concerned with the advancement of our colleges and universities. We must educate—but first we must study. Let it be said of us, as of Chaucer's scholar, 'Gladly would he learn, and gladly teach'."[75]

The 'Specialized Generalist' Appears

H. Russell Blintzer, ACPRA's president for 1962-63, was a Pennsylvania Dutchman described as "just as stubborn as those Dutchmen always are." At the same time he hated "yes men," and some of his associates were convinced that he sometimes provoked arguments just to make sure he got all points of view.

"He was the most persuasive man I've ever heard," declared Denton Beal, who served as director of public relations under Bintzer at Carnegie Tech. "He could argue you right out of your back teeth if he wanted to. I'm sure many of the hot debates we had were deliberate on his part, to see if I had good reasons for a proposal, when all the time he had been way ahead of me."[76]

When Bintzer was introduced as ACPRA's new president at the Greenbrier on July 4, he voiced, half facetiously, the hope that his year in office would be a "Year of Ignition"—the one which would "provide the liftoff in the direction that Art Schaefer's "Year of Transition" charted . . . so that my successor should be able to look forward to guiding an Association that is heading into orbit in the educational universe."[77]

Although he described himself as "a battered but wiser man," Bintzer in his presidential address at the 1963 conference recalled his hope of a year earlier with the good humor that usually surfaced even during one of his hottest debates.

"Facetious though it was meant to be," he said, "the statement portended more than one could have envisioned in his wildest dreams—or nightmares. Take warning—be careful what you ignite; it can and does, on occasion, lead to violent explosion! The fallout from such an explosion—in this case, letters—can be most revealing. For one thing, I've found out that among the interests and hobbies of our members, there are some who embrace ornithology. And, curiously, each of these ornithological hobbyists reveals the same inability to spell.

"I came to these conclusions," Bintzer continued, "on the basis of the following two facts: (1) these members sent me letters in which they likened me to a certain long-legged, heavy bird that is native to Africa and Asia, and (2) each of those who did so, spelled the name of the bird incorrectly. So, in the interests of accuracy and to preserve good relations with the Audubon Society, I must inform these correspondents that the correct spelling of that bird's name is B-U-S-T-A-R-D.

"Come to think of it—a mellifluous alliterative phrase results when one contemplates a baby bustard born out of wedlock—or whatever arrangements big bustards have to assure propagation of the species. Which gives rise to a thought—I wonder if those who corresponded with me thusly are not ornithologists at all? Maybe they never even heard of the bustard!"[78]

Bintzer implied (but did not assert) that some of the explosions coming during the year had resulted from his effort to carry out a pledge made as he assumed office. For two years the Board of Trustees had tried without success to carry out a recommendation of the Study Commission of 1960 that "a more appropriate name be found for the Association." "I shall try again this year to get this matter resolved to your satisfaction," Bintzer had promised.[79]

When the Executive Committee met on November 10, Bintzer reaffirmed his aim of seeking to resolve the name change problem during 1962-63, outlined a presentation he planned to make at district meetings, and indicated his desire for the name change to be considered by mail ballot in the spring of 1963. In a meeting the next day, ACPRA's Board of Trustees authorized the Executive Committee to propose a new name for the Association for possible recommendation to the membership.

The Executive Committee during a meeting March 31 and April 1 agreed that a mail ballot should be conducted in May if the committee and then the trustees could agree on a name to recommend. The ballots would then be counted by three past presidents—Schaefer, Brandon, and Reck—and the results announced at the Chicago conference.

After extensive discussion concentrated on ten of approximately 150 names suggested in the past, the committee defeated, 4 to 3, a motion that the name "Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities" be recommended. After additional discussion, the committee voted unanimously to recommend the name, "Association for College and University Advancement." By April 15, all of the twenty-five trustees had cast their vote, all but two of them in favor of the name proposed.[80] After ballots had been mailed two weeks later to the offical voting member of each member institution, strong opposition developed and resulted in a memo to all members mailed early in May over the names of forty-four members from half as many states. The signers, who included six past presidents, held that the vote was illegal inasmuch as the motion to table action on the name change adopted at Denver had not been removed from the table at any meeting of members held since then. "The change of name is a serious matter," they asserted, "and the *pros* and *cons* should be carefully considered by all the members, not just the representative trustees and officers, no matter how responsible they are." They also listed, with elaboration, three reasons why they opposed the proposed name, "Association of College and University Advancement": (1) "It is presumptuous." (2) "It is not precisely representative of the programs and policies of our offices or the individuals who serve in them." (3) "It is meaningless in many respects for our type of organization."

"While we look with favor on the present name of American College Public Relations Association, and appreciate and respect its accomplishments, we are not opposed to a change of name as such," the signers concluded. "We would welcome a new name if it were more descriptive and meaningful than the present one. We do, however, oppose the procedure for attempting to change the name without a discussion or without a formal presentation of the *pros* and *cons*, and we oppose the new name proposed for the reasons given above."[81]

After a series of telephone conversations between Bintzer and members of the Executive Committee on May 20, it was decided to invalidate the referendum on the proposed name change, to destroy all ballots, and to keep no tally of votes cast. In a memo dated June 1, Bintzer informed the membership of the decision and indicated that the name change question would be discussed at the Chicago conference but no vote taken.

"The Executive Committee," his memo concluded, "wishes to make it clear that its convictions regarding both the proposed name and the propriety of the method used in presenting it to the membership for the vote remains unchanged. The present action is being taken in recognition of the views of certain respected members and in the interest of preserving unity of the Association."

The matter of name change was disposed of for 1962-63 when the members in attendance at the annual conference in Chicago passed the following motion made by a past president, James R. Jordan: "That (1) the Executive Committee during this year (1963-64) continue to study the desirability of a name change and to consider a suitable name or names; (2) the Executive Committee during this year make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees on this subject; (3) if it is determined that a name change is desirable that a proposed name be submitted to the membership by mail ballot, this ballot to include brief statements *pro* and *con* or a case for each side; and (4) that in any mail ballot, choice be given the member institutions between one proposed name and the present name."[82]

The priority schedule followed by the national office in 1961-62—"how to" publications, institutes and workshops, district activities, the national meeting, and research, in that order—had proved so successful that the Board of Trustees decided to continue it in 1962-63 but with greater emphasis on quality in all cases. To do so, however, called for additional personnel and before January 1 the total staff included eleven persons, seven of them full time. When Leo C. Muller, assistant to the chancellor for planning and development at the University of Buffalo, joined the staff as director of educational programs on September 1, he had become the national office's second full-time executive. His duties included planning and oversight of publications, institutes, workshops, district programs, and the national conference. Other new personnel included a secretary who also served as coordinator of membership procedures; a secretary with supervisory control of files, records, reports, supplies, and equipment; a receptionist who also had charge of business records, purchase orders, and shipments; and a national conference director on a part-time basis. The budget adopted by the Executive Committee also made provision for increased travel allowances for district meetings, established fringe benefits for national office employees, and, for the first time, provided partial reimbursement for members of the Board of Trustees traveling to meetings.[83]

To finance the program with increased personnel and emphasis on quality, the Executive Committee set a budget of $205,400, including $20,000 for the 1963 national meeting and $100,050 for personnel. Because the membership gave promise of continued growth, it was expected that $120,000 would be received for fees this year as compared to $93,206 the year before. Hopefully, gifts, which accounted for only $15,950 of the income for 1961-62, could be pushed to $50,000.[84]

With its councils assisting in the planning, the Association held seven workshops in 1962-63. The largest of all, that on foundation relations, drew an attendance of more than 300 for two days in November. The others concentrated on publications (two), educational planning, deferred giving, the special gift, and effective writing.[85]

ACPRA's president held that "the strength of the Association is rooted in the districts,"[86] and consequently he demanded increased attention to its eleven districts. He appointed a seven-man committee, headed by Quentin Ault of Tulane University, to study district organization, geographical boundaries, and membership to determine steps needed, if any, to strengthen the Association through a reorganization of present districts.[87]

The national office secured a stable of twelve authoritative speakers willing to address district meetings, and at least two national officers attended each meeting. Three of the year's seven workshops were held in conjunction with district meetings and attendance was higher than in any previous year.[88] By this time many of the district meetings, with attendance as high as 250, were larger than most of the national meetings had been prior to 1950.

The bylaws adopted in December, 1960, had provided for three councils within the Association—the Council on Financial Support for Higher Education, the Council on Public Relations for Higher Education, and the Council on Management of Advancement Programs.[89] The council system was supposed to help unify the Association membership, but instead had served as a devisive influence, especially since there had not been adequate delineation of the councils' areas of responsibility and authority. Following a study of council relationships somewhat along the line Patrick Nicholson had suggested in his report in June, 1962, a committee, headed by James H. Denison, recommended in June, 1963, that "(1) the councils should serve as bodies *advisory* to the Board of Trustees, not as semiautonomous operating entities as at present, and (2) the trustees should assume responsibility for directing the program activities of the Association and should program for the Association as a whole, rather than for identified interest groups."

Denison's committee suggested that a commission be appointed "to consider the probable effects of the recommendations and to recommend feasible methods of putting them into effect at the earliest practicable time." The trustees then passed along to the Board of Trustees for 1963-64 the recommendation that a commission be appointed.[90] The new board at a meeting before the Chicago conference accepted the recommendations made by Denison, and asked him to head the commission.

Creation of a Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy was among the important actions of the Bintzer administration. With Roland C. Matthies, vice president and treasurer of Wittenberg University, as its chairman, this committee year after year collected information on taxes, kept members of the Association informed about proposed taxes and their implications, participated in hearings on proposed tax legislation, and made recommendations for action by the American Council on Education.[91]

Services which ACPRA had been providing to members in recent years were continued and in some cases expanded in 1962-63. The Publications Critique Service, popular since its creation by Gail E. Myers, vice president of Monticello College, in 1958, used the services of twenty-five volunteers to cover requests for information and recommendations. The materials planned to aid colleges in their deferred giving programs were again popular, although few colleges could agree on layout, design, style, or content. The materials won four regional or national awards for design after their introduction in 1961-62.[92]

Each of the classified advertisements running in the placement service section of ACPRA *Newsletter* was receiving an average of fifteen replies. Still, this method of assisting the Association's members, institutions, and member representatives to meet placement needs was considered only mildly successful. Consequently, the Association joined with the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, the American Alumni Council, and the College and University Personnel Association in a proposal for major foundation support to establish a placement service for nonacademic administrators serving in all areas of institutional life.[93]

One of the individuals added to ACPRA's staff in 1962-63 gave half of her time to cataloging, organizing, and administering the Lending Library, which was growing constantly. The revised Honors Competition of the preceding year had produced case study material related to 170 advancement programs. A gift from Sears, Roebuck enabled the national office to bind materials preparatory to distribution. And before the end of the 1962-63 fiscal year more than sixty bound volumes, including reference books and manuals, articles, speeches, surveys, and reports were available. In addition, the library contained some 5,000 institutional publications collected by the national office in recent years. Materials were lent for ten days to member institutions making formal requests and a fee of $5 was charged for the first day materials were held beyond the ten days and for each week thereafter.[94]

The Executive Committee and national office had anticipated that philanthropic funds would become available to support and enlarge the library, but these were not forthcoming. The Executive Committee at its spring meeting accepted an invitation of the American Alumni Council to operate the Lending Library jointly during 1963-64, pooling services and sharing expenses. Meanwhile, ACE launched efforts to build a library for internal use and for visiting administrators. When this was accomplished, ACPRA's reference materials could be housed in a segment of the ACE Library, located on the same floor of the ACE building as ACPRA.[95]

Other major cooperative efforts of 1962-63 found ACPRA joining with CFAE in holding a special seminar on educational finance for trustees, presidents, and development officers and with Mead Papers and AAC in the second annual Campus Graphics Exhibition held at the Library of Ideas, this year in Chicago as well as New York. Made possible by the Johnson Foundation, the special seminar was held at Racine, Wisconsin, as a pilot program testing the desirability of a nationwide series of similar meetings.[96] Sixty-three institutions took part in the graphics exhibition and again the entries were used as a special exhibit at the national conference.[97]

Now regarded as a great source of material for the Lending Library, the National Honors Competitions were expanded by action of the Board of Trustees with initial stages of the competitions conducted in the districts. From more than 1,000 entries in district competitions, 236 winners were chosen for the national competitions. Of these sixty-four received awards in eleven categories—public relations projects and programs, management of programs, special publications, general publications, news bureau, audio-visual, legislative relations, annual giving projects and programs, capital giving projects and programs, deferred giving programs, and special programs in financial support.[98]

The Association's 1962-63 budget with its provision for increased personnel had been set at $205,400 on the basis of two assumptions: (1) that membership of the Association would continue to grow, thus increasing the workload of the national office, and (2) that foundation support would be forthcoming for the expanding program. The first assumption proved to be correct, with the number of member representatives climbing steadily until it reached 2,650 by the time of the annual conference in June.[99]

The second assumption proved to be incorrect. When it became evident that the Association was facing a large deficit, the Executive Committee at a meeting in Washington March 31-April 1 revised the budget downward to $180,075 with $35,000 of the funds anticipated from grants eliminated.[100] Austerity in spending whenever possible was directed.

Research, which had received much less attention than intended over the past three years, was all but suspended. Before the end of the year the national office staff was reduced to eight. The publications schedule was also reduced by shelving a study on gift records and reports, a book and a newsletter on governing boards, and publication of papers from the workshop on "The Special Gift" held in San Francisco. The publications program, however, had already furnished members with three helpful pieces, *Better Publications* and *Understanding Foundation Support*, composed of papers presented at workshops held in October, and a ninety-six-page directory of programs and members. The ACPRA *Newsletter* also continued to bring members news of general interest and *College and University Journal*, still edited on a part-time basis by Richard W. Smith, was maintained at the quality which had gained it widespread recognition the year before. Its paid circulation now exceeded 4,000 and presidents of all member institutions were also receiving copies.[101]

The *Journal* was building a reputation based on the eminence of some contributors, the quality of its articles, the diversity of its features, and the fine balance of its content. Among the contributors to the issue for Fall, 1962, were Charles Malik, former president of the UN General Assembly, and Jacques Barzun, dean of faculties and provost of Columbia University. Malik's article, adapted from the address which he gave on "The Changeless in a World of Change" at the 1962 conference, warned that some things "have not transited since the dawn of Western Civilization and will never transit."

"This is truly a transitional moment in history," said Malik, "and education must not only take note of this fact; it must above all seek to control it. For it is possible to be so swept away by the tides of change, it is possible to develop such an infatuation and craze for change as to lose sight of the fact that the essential things are all changeless. The greatest challenge of transition is not the transition itself; the greatest challenge is to be so clear and certain in you own mind as to hold fast to that which can never be subject to transition. The greatest challenge is to know *how to harness the winds of change*."[102]

The Spring, 1963, issue of the *Journal* recieved special commendation, for its first photographic feature, a fifteen-page section called "Old Main—a Portfolio of Nineteenth Century Campus Buildings."[103] The issue also carried a special section on college public relations discussed in relation to the mass media, public attitudes, the ideal campus, and interpretation of the institution.

"The ideal function of the organized public relations program in higher education," wrote Thomas P. Nickell, Jr., vice president for planning at the University of Southern California, "is *not* to hold up a trick mirror in order to convey the most flattering image of a mediocre institution. The function is instead to hold up a true mirror to the institution itself so that it may see and remove its blemishes.

"And the function of public relations in higher education is also to hold up for the public a magnifying lens of the greatest clarity so that all may see the small miracles: scholars shaping ideas; students grasping theories; determined minds asking questions of the universe—and sometimes receiving answers. . . .

"The task of maintaining good public relations will never be something to treat lightly," Nickell concluded. "We hold that higher education is vital to our nation—to our free society. And if society is to be strengthened by higher education, it must give strength in return. Public relations in higher education strives to make clear the reasons why the people of our nation should support the college and the university. This cannot be done by a department of public relations or by 2,000 of them.

"Public relations is much more than a departmental function. It is the effect of each meeting between higher education and the public. Each man and woman who works in a laboratory, at a desk, or from a lectern in our nation's halls of learning must be responsible for the effect of these meetings."[104]

One of the bylaws adopted in 1960, that calling for the terms in office of trustees, councilors, and other national and district officers to start with the beginning of the fiscal year August 1, had provided some stumbling blocks for smooth transition. As a result, the Association's trustees at their meeting in November, 1962, voted to seek approval of the membership for a revision which would call for terms of all such individuals, whether elected or appointed, to start at the time of the Association's annual conference and continue until the next annual conference. In case no conference was held, terms would commence with the beginning of the next fiscal year as in the past. The membership voted almost unanimously for the change.

The trustees at their November meeting also began looking at membership regulations and qualifications. Junior colleges were being established in large numbers, but many held that the membership fee, which stood above $100 for most of them, depending on enrollment, was too high.

Executive Vice President Jackson recommended that the fee for such colleges be reduced to $50, regardless of enrollment, and that for this fee they be entitled to one member representative. At the same time Jackson suggested that secondary schools be permitted to join the Association as educational associates at $50 per fiscal year. Committees were named to study both recommendations. A flat fee of $100 was set for junior colleges in 1966. Names of academies began appearing among those of educational associates in 1964, but it was not until 1969 that official action was taken to welcome nonprofit secondary schools as members in this category.

In accordance with the practice of deciding on conference cities three years in advance, ACPRA's Executive Committee investigated sites for the 1966 national conference and chose Boston. Cincinnati had earlier been selected for the 1965 conference and June 27-30 were now selected as the dates.[105]

James Jackson, the Association's executive vice president since August 1, 1961, submitted his resignation to the Executive Committee on April 1. In August he became associated with the Art Center School of Los Angeles and the First Accrediting Corporation of America (FACA). In his new post Jackson, with offices in Pomona, California, would head the College and University Division of FACA, designed to help charitable enterprises secure private financing.[106]

Immediately after the April meeting, ACPRA's officers moved to find a new executive vice president who could assume his duties on August 1. On May 7, 8 and 14 President Bintzer made telephone calls to members of the Executive Committee, reporting his recommendation that John W. Leslie, director of development and public relations at Lewis and Clark College of Portland, Oregon, be named to succeed Jackson. Approval by the committee members was unanimous.[107]

Leslie had started his career in public relations in 1949 as a student assistant under Jackson when the latter was public relations chief at William and Mary. Before and after four years in the Air Force, Leslie was a sports reporter in Newport News, Virginia. In 1958 he had become an associate director for Ketchum, Inc., until he assumed his Lewis and Clark post in 1960.[108]

When the Board of Trustees met in Chicago in June, President Bintzer reported that Leo C. Muller, director of educational programs for the past year, was resigning to become assistant to the president of St. Louis University. The Executive Committee for 1963-64, in session on June 22, decided that continuation of the position of director of educational programs was essential and a search for Muller's successor began.[109]

With Bernard Taylor serving as conference director on a half-time basis, planning for the 1963 conference coming up in Chicago in June 24-26 received greater attention than in any past year. The 1962 conference at the Greenbrier had produced criticisms concerning fees and the large number of sessions held concurrently. The 1963 schedule was consequently reduced to three days, although a special program for newcomers was set for the evening of June 23. The number of concurrent sessions, most of them "how-to" seminars or discussions arranged with the assistance of the Association's three councils, were also reduced by one-third. Twenty-six "question box sessions with the pros" of the type that had proved popular the year before climaxed the three days.[110]

Speakers scheduled for the general session had much to do with drawing a record registration of more than 950 to the Chicago conference. Lyndon B. Johnson, vice president of the United States, gave the address at the annual dinner, while Francis Keppel, U. S. Commissioner of Education, spoke on Monday night. Arthur L. Brandon, vice president for public relations at New York University and president of the Association when it changed its name from ACPA to ACPRA in 1946, delivered the keynote address at the first general session.

Brandon, making his third keynote address at an ACPRA convention, took "Education's Hospitality to Change" as his subject.[111] "Changes are sometimes reflected by the questions that are asked about education," Brandon declared. "Today the query is, 'Is it *viable*?' Yesterday it was, 'Is it *relevant?*' in earlier years, it was asked, 'Does it aid in the *acquisition of knowledge?*' or 'Does it *further mental discipline?*' These oft-repeated words and phrases help to point up the march of higher education, as one phase melds into another."

Pointing up the changes made in the college public relations field, Brandon said: "In 1917, at the inception of this organization, the news bureau, with its one-man staff, was the sole professional purveyor of public information. As the public's relationship to institutions and its interest in the success or failure of the institutions grew, the need for more diversified services and skills increased until today, in fewer than fifty years, we have had added to our portfolios every area of participation, of service, of communication that is conceivable. We have built many bridges between the public and our institutions. We have also opened many new avenues of cooperation and participation.

"This proliferation of tasks and activities has been the result of an increased interest on the part of the public in organizations of social content, and the awakening of citizens to their civic responsibilities. The advance planning on the part of the colleges, the phenominal growth of educational public relations and fund raising and the stepped-up interest in alumni organization are all a natural concomitant of this growing public concern. We are now witnessing democracy in action, and we have had our part in inducing that action. . . .

"These communication developments bring increasing responsibilities to the communicators. An American orbiting in space sends a message of good will to African leaders meeting in Ethiopia. Other Americans commit acts which create ill will when transmitted in words and pictures to all parts of the world. What we do often communicates more than what we say. . . .

"In meeting the necessity for mass communication, we must not forget either the value or the necessity for personal or individual communication," Brandon continued. "Many misunderstandings extend or multiply themselves from failure to inform individuals or seek their counsel. Most of our opportunities for success evolve from personal influence with individuals. This influence obtains especially in fund-raising activities. Personal attention given to our constituents nurtures loyalty and support.

"Let me note parenthetically that I do not see much functional difference in public relations or fund raising or development. Where they are not alike they are supplementary. Not much money can be raised for a college without good public relations. A college's outside public relations shines at its brightest when it gets a significant gift. And none of our development or public relations work is worthwhile unless we keep uppermost in our minds that we seek to serve society and the individual through education. . . .

"The need for planning, publicizing, promoting, and 'politicking' on behalf of colleges will never end so long as we wish to provide education for our people," Brandon concluded. "In the midst of change there will always be basic requirements.

"When this Association was founded, its first president, the late T. T. Frankenberg, said, 'If schools are to achieve their maximum possibilities, they must be kept close to the people. In order that this may be true, the people must know about them. This is the service to which you and I are called'.

"This is the work in which we are engaged now—this service of keeping the public close to our colleges and universities. It means working for broader and deeper understanding and wider and greater support. This is a need for higher education today. This is our opportunity and our challenge. How could we wish for anything better?"

As a Texan, Pat Nicholson had been commissioned to get Vice President Johnson as the speaker for the conference dinner and the latter readily consented. In midafternoon Nicholson was informed that Johnson, in St. Louis in place of President Kennedy, who was visiting Ireland, would be unable to arrive in Chicago until about 8:45. Rather than cancel the address, it was decided to start the dinner as late as possible and stall until the Vice President arrived.

The audience was just about to walk out when Nicholson received word that LBJ would be outside the hotel in two minutes. He rushed outside, greeted the Vice President, and attempted to speed him into the dining room as soon as possible. Just as they were nearing the door, however, LBJ stopped and went over to get a closer look at a dress he had spied in a woman's dress shop. The dress was yellow, a color he liked to see on Lady Bird. After a careful study through the glass, he instructed an aide to determine the size and price of the gown and how early the shop would open in the morning. He then went in, more than two hours late, received a standing ovation, and delivered his address.[112]

Johnson emphasized the proliferating needs for more and better education as the United States and Russia engaged in a race for supremacy. He gave the conference delegates much to think about in his address titled "A National Concern."

"This is not a time for timid minds and torpid spirits," he declared."It is a time for finding the best solutions to the worst of problems—and one of our big problems is higher education."

Commenting on a recent study which showed that the United States might have to spend as much as $12 billion annually for colleges and universities by 1970, the Vice President declared, "Our needs are enormous. Our needs are urgent.

"Unless we want to go to bed by the light of a Communist moon; unless we resign ourselves to surrender and return to the tusk and the tooth, we have no choice but to meet this challenge head on," he continued.

"We must attack this problem in a partnership for national profit; a partnership of colleges and universities, business and industry, state and federal government, and students and parents. . . . Experience over the years has made one fact clear: you pay for a proper system of education in one way or another. Either you pay for this purpose as an investment in the future—or if you fail to provide enough funds, you pay negatively in lost payrolls, lost taxes, and worst of all, lost opportunity for our young citizens.

"In truth, the state that demands the most from its future has no choice. It must invest fully in its institutions of higher education. It cannot turn away from this decision any more than it can turn away from tomorrow."

While education is, and always has been a local problem, it is also a national concern, the Vice President emphasized. "If our national posture must be stern, our national purpose must be strong," he asserted. "The question is not whether we should have federal help for local education . . . The question now is how best can the national government help the private arena and the local government keep their higher education healthy. . . .

"Perhaps this partnership of colleges, universities, business, industry, state and federal government, and parents and students joined in common concert may be the answer. I know it must be so. I know this because I believe in this land and its people because we are strong and free, because we understand. That in its highest sense, is the reason for higher education."[113]

Keppel, in his address on "Interrelated Paths to Our Common Goals," held that one large problem arises because "We tend to overestimate the public's awareness of the problems of our educational system."

"Our first problem, yours and mine," he said, "is to contribute to a national and pervasive awareness of the interrelationships between education and progress — economic, social, moral, personal, and national. At the same time we must recognize that the educational enterprise is a public trust and a public responsibility, that the answer to finding ways to finance its improvement lies in concerted public action. In private institutions as well as public ones, this concerted action is a composite of individual concern, individual effort, and individual action, through a variety of economic channels. If individuals are silent, one can only conclude that they do not understand or do not care. It is our job to see that they do understand, and that they do care.

"As Frank Moore Colby once said, 'The attempt to turn a complex problem of the head into a simple moral question for the heart to answer is, of course, a necessary part of all political discussions'. This is also the central task of college fund raising and public relations, to lead people to *want* to do what common sense tells them somebody *has* to do. But let us make no mistake about this: The answer from the heart will be far more fruitful if the 'complex problem of the head' is clearly understood, if the objectives are realistic enough, if the anticipated gains are big enough. Our success in improving opportunities in higher education, therefore, depends upon what we do about attitudes and understandings, for these are the basis of action."[114]

ACPRA's 1963 award for distinguished service to higher education was presented in Chicago to John Marshall Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation since its founding in 1955. "Under his direction," the citation read in part, "the program of the Corporation has achieved for scholarship new appreciation and respect, has enhanced public awareness of talent and its importance, has furthered for school and college alike higher standards of education and testing, and has developed within the corporate leadership of our nation an increasing responsibility and concern for higher education."[115]

Although an austerity program had been ordered in late winter when it became evident that the year's expenditures were on the way to establishing a large deficit, expenditures for 1962-63 zoomed to $223,129, more than $43,000 above the revised budget. The excess grew largely from expenditures beyond budget in the travel, telegraph, telephone, postage, and publications lines. Although four planned publications were dropped because of lack of funds, the cost of publications for the year still went some $10,000 beyond initital expectations. Fortunately, income for the year also exceeded expectations, totaling $212,622 despite the fact that gifts and grants brought in only $6,137 as compared to the $50,000 anticipated orginally. Subscriptions and sales of publications and registration fees for the national meetings, institutes, and regional workshops rescued the budget. The balance which had been built up during Lyle Nelson's administration in 1960-61 covered the deficit for 1962-63, as it had those of the preceding two years, but was down to $8,836 as the 1963-64 year started.[116]

When the Board of Trustees for 1963-64 held a meeting in Chicago on June 22 it named James H. Denison of Michigan State University president-elect, and Dyar Massey of Emory University secretary. Fred C. Hess, Jr., of Grinnell College, A. Westley Rowland of Michigan State University, and James S. Triolo of the University of Texas were elected to serve on the Executive Committee along with Denison, Massey, the new president, Horace Hewlett, and Bintzer, the out-going president, and the executive vice president.[117]

One of the critics who had written President Bintzer one of the letters mentioned early in this chapter had charged that a group within ACPRA was taking itself too seriously. Members of the Association, he said, "should not try to get too big for their britches for we're *all* cogs in a giant administrative machine."

Before he turned the presidential gavel over to Hewlett at Chicago, Bintzer sought to answer this critic in his presidential address. He tried to expand the horizons of his listeners by presenting his concept of "specialized generalists," the individuals he envisioned as the leaders in college advancement programs of the future.

"Even if we should fail to work conscientiously on the means of creating these 'specialized generalists'," Bintzer said, "I believe that the growth of philanthropic support for higher education will force their emergence. It is clear that more people—corporations,, foundations, legislatures, religious bodies—are providing more support for more colleges and universities than ever before. This is good, but it also carries with it the seed of failure for some of us unless we awaken to the full implications of this interest.

"I refer to the obvious scrutiny which is falling upon us as we accept more and more support from others. To the need for interpreting our institutions honestly and well to the constituencies that are natural ones for our respective institutions. To the need for devising productive and ethical means of meeting the competition for the philanthropic and tax dollar. To the urgency for uncovering new sources of support and winning those sources over to our point of view. To the involvement of the total university family in these efforts.

"All of this, I submit, bespeaks the need for more efficient and more useful assembling of pertinent information. For utilizing this information in more productive fashion. For building into our activities the bases for new and expanded functions as the need for them arises.

"This calls for the closest integration of the best efforts we can put forth in public relations, alumni relations, community relations, publications, mailing services, student relations, etc. I believe that both the scope and pace of these activities in the years ahead will require more than just coordination of these specialty functions. To a very large degree, the successful institutions in the years ahead will make wide use of people broadly trained and knowledgeable in all of these specialties—hence the 'specialized generalist'." This new breed of administrator will depend heavily on skilled aides to uncover and assemble the data needed for him to make innovative judgments. And because of his own broad training, he will then bring just the proper 'mix' of specialty functions to bear on any given function."

Bintzer expressed his belief that ACPRA, by its very nature, must take a leading part in fostering the 'specialized generalist' concept.

"I believe," he declared, "that we should construct the kind of association that will encourage our member representatives to grow broadly and in depth. We no longer should be content with policies and programs that simply help fund raisers to be better fund raisers, or public relations practitioners to be better public relations men. Our programs, practices, and philosophy should encourage fund raisers to become sound public relations people; and alumni relations people to become community relations conscious; and public relations people to become good fund raisers; and all of them to become able administrators with an abiding concern for the welfare of higher education. This is probably a different philosophy than that which characterized the ACPRA of a decade ago. But that statement draws no distinction between good or bad; strong or weak; right or wrong. It simply recognizes a change in climate; a different set of circumstances; a new group of goals. . . .

"If such ambition—such a view of the future for our Association—makes us too big for our britches, then I agree that we are cogs in the most colloquial sense of the word—and we deserve to remain so.

"But a timely phenomenon in education's 'hospitality to change' is being manifested in the fourth major administrative function that *is* growing up on many campuses side by side with the more traditional divisions of academic affairs, student affairs, and business affairs. It is neither public relations, nor fund raising, nor news bureau, nor publications, nor community relations, nor any *one* other specialized craft or profession. And yet it is *all* of these—for the absence of any one of them will weaken its total and effective functioning. Thus it requires the time and talents of a widely diverse group of knowlegeable people to function—all of whom should be working in harmony for the common purpose of institutional advancement. To do this job, it also draws on the time and talents of the president, the faculty, the trustees, the alumni, the church, and scores of volunteer friends. To the extent that they become involved, they, too, are serving the purpose of institutional advancement.

"It is in this context and with this vision that I see an opportunity for our Association that must not be missed. If it will but build on the talents of those already a part of it; if it will encourage the fusion of those talents for the good of education both in the Association and in the university; if it will encourage newcomers to higher education to embrace this concept; if it will pursue the maturity of purpose envisioned for it by the Study Commission and accepted by the membership in 1960; if it will do these things, it *can* offer to *all* its member representatives broader and deeper opportunities for growth in competency and in responsibility. In the process of so doing, it will become the dominant voice for this relatively new and rapidly growing administrative area within a circle of the most respected educational associations."[118]

Three-Year Plan Drawn

Noting that ACPRA now included on its roster more than 2,600 member representatives bearing 483 different titles, Horace Hewlett assumed the presidency of ACPRA with the warning: "Growth inevitably brings change—change which we must recognize and to which we must adapt our attitudes and our institutions."

"The problems that this Association has encountered during recent years," Hewlett said at the Association's annual business meeting in Chicago, "were unavoidable and reflect a continuing evolution wrought by two basic causes since ACPRA's founding in 1917: a steady increase in numbers and an everwidening spectrum of interests. These are healthy, encouraging pressures which hold high promise for the Association's future if we are wise, mature, and understanding enough to adjust our minds and our professional responses to ever-changing needs . . . .

"To some it may seem that we, as an Association, spend much of our time in self-examination . . . . Obviously, we do, But is this not a sign of health, rather than disease? Many dedicated members with heavy institutional responsibilities have devoted countless hours to this organization's well-being. Thus, I suspect, it will always be, and for this we should be ever grateful . . . . For the year ahead I see continued study, deliberation, and discussion.

"Happily, many of our present problems are the result of our success, yet we can never consider our work completed. We shall always face new challenges from which we cannot back away, but must meet head-on with courage and imagination. Our debates over name change and other matters during the past few years were no more than symptoms of our Association's growth, our personal concern for its future, and, basically, our inner knowledge that each of us has a significant role to play in the single most important factor in this country's future: the integrity of American education. I know of no cause more worthy of the best we can give, and none that returns such rich rewards for honest effort invested."[119]

Hewlett's background qualified him to speak with authority, not only regarding ACPRA and its challenges but also concerning American education in general. Bud, as he was best known to his friends and colleagues, had gained his first experience in college public relations in 1946-47. He then worked as an assistant under Edward Whittlesey when the latter was director of public relations at the University of Denver shortly after his year as the Association's president. Bud next became director of public relations at Amherst College, his alma mater, with enlarged duties. At the time he became ACPRA's president he was also editor of *New England Association Review*, the offical quarterly of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; a member of the Massachussetts Executive Committee on Educational Television, which was charged with planning and developing the role of the state in this field, and president of the Western Massachussetts Broadcasting Council, Inc. In ACPRA itself he had held national offices or carried major committee assignments during six of the preceding ten years.[120]

Hewlett's administration was marked by comprehensive long-range planning, emphasizing greater liaison with the American Alumni Council, changes in the Association's organizational structure and fiscal policies, further enlargement of services, and more efficient business procedures.

Approximately one-third of ACPRA's members were also members of AAC and the officers of both associations realized that such overlap was resulting in considerable duplication of effort. Presidents of the two organizations, Verne A. Stadtman of the University of California for AAC and Hewlett for ACPRA, consequently named, with the blessing of their Executive Committees, a joint committee of eight members to examine areas and methods through which closer cooperation between the two organizations could be achieved. Representing ACPRA were James H. Denison, Michigan State University, president-elect; Dyar Massey, Emory University, secretary-treasurer; John Leslie, the Association's new executive vice president; and Hewlett. AAC's representatives were Beatrice M. Field, Tulane University, president-elect; George H. Colton, Dartmouth College; John G. Johnson, executive director; and Stadtman.[121]

Twice during the year, on September 6-7 and again on April 10, this Liaison Committee met in Washington and discussed opportunities for cooperation on district and national conferences, lending library, placement service, and workshops. By this time four of ACPRA's districts—Mid-American, Rocky Mountain, Pacific Northwest, and West Coast—were holding joint or tandem conferences with AAC districts. After weighing thoroughly the advantages and disadvantages of joint meetings, the committee decided that the former far outweighed the latter. One drawback to joint district meetings was the fact that regional boundaries for the two organizations were different. However, ACPRA's Executive Committee at a meeting preceding the Liaison Committee's session of April 10 voted to recommend that the Board of Trustees eliminate the Mid-South and Rocky Mountain districts and thus reduce the number of districts from eleven to nine with the following alignment: New England—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; Middle Atlantic—Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania; Mason-Dixon—District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virgina, and West Virginia; Southeastern—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee; Great Lakes—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin; Southwest—Arkansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas; Mid-America—Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming; Pacific Northwest—Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington; Far West—Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, and Utah. It was hoped that the realignment could become effective on September 1, 1965, but action on the proposal was deferred to the 1964-65 Board of Trustees.[122] Meeting in Los Angeles on July 4, the new board adopted the recommendation with only one change, that placing Utah in the Pacific Northwest instead of the Far West district.[123]

Both ACPRA and AAC had begun to question the policy of holding annual national conferences and the Liaison Committee decided to explore the possibility of alternate-year meetings. Such a plan would call for AAC to hold a national conference one year, ACPRA the next. Each Association would include on its conference program sessions of interest to members of the other organization. A plan of this nature, it was apparent, would eliminate the current substantional duplication in programming and reduce costs both for the organizations and for their members.[124] In straw votes taken at district meetings during the year ACPRA members were virtually unanimous in their support of ACPRA-AAC national conferences and favored the alternate-year overwhelmingly. AAC polled its membership informally on the question of alternate-year conferences and reported that a majority favored the idea, "but with varying enthusiasm." President Stadtman announced in February that AAC expected to take a more careful and conclusive poll later in the year. Also in February Leslie, carrying out instructions from ACPRA's trustees, extended an invitation for AAC to join in a national conference in 1967. AAC was unable to accept the invitation because of commitments already made with a San Francisco hotel, but in turn invited ACPRA to join with it for the 1968 meeting in Miami Beach.[125]

Cordiality prevailed throughout the second meeting of the Liaison Committee on April 10 and it appeared that cooperatively planned national conferences would become a reality in 1968 and 1969 with AAC hosting that in 1968 and ACPRA the one in 1969. It was agreed that the boards of both organizations would discuss the matter at their summer meetings, after which the national offices could proceed with the resultant plans. ACPRA's Board of Trustees approved the plan for alternate-year conferences on July 4 in Los Angeles and a major step forward in ACPRA-AAC relations seemed assured.

The merger of AAC and ACPRA libraries into one lending library housed in the former's quarters became a reality on October 1, 1963, after the Liaison Committee had completed financial arrangements. The annual cost for this service to members of both organizations had earlier been estimated at $20,000, but in September this figure was revised downward to $15,000 to be divided on a fifty-fifty basis. The arrangement proved satisfactory with members of both organizations getting increased benefit from the materials available and the fifty-fifty arrangement was endorsed for continuation in 1964-65.[126]

Placement services got extensive attention at both meetings of the Liaison Committee, but it was evident that merger of the services would be difficult in the near future because of policy differences between the two organizations. The executive officers, Leslie and Johnson, were directed to work out a proposal for later consideration by the Liaison Committee. Meanwhile, ACPRA changed its own policy by introducing the *Placement Letter*, which carried classified advertisements formerly printed in the *Newsletter*. Last of these advertisements were printed in the *Newsletter* for October, 1963. The *Placement Letter* which first appeared in *October*, 1964, as "a monthly service of ACPRA for personnel in college public relations, development, and related administrative positions," was made available only on a subscription basis, the charge ranging from $1 for a single issue to $5 for an annual subscription. No charge was made to member institutions for insertions, but individuals were charged ten cents a word for a single insertion, fifteen cents a word for two consecutive insertions.[127]

The Liaison Committee decided that AAC and ACPRA had "a rather clear road ahead on cooperation in workshops on an informal basis." The executive officers of the two organizations were instructed to coordinate the planning of workshops to avoid overlapping in dates or program and to see that invitations to participate went to members of both organizations.[128]

After Leo Muller resigned from the post of director of educational programs, the Executive Committee had decided in June, 1963, that continuance of the position was essential and authorized Leslie to seek a replacement. Announcement was made in October that John E. Bennett, a public relations director for Ketchum, Inc., had been selected to join the staff in December. With his arrival and that of Nancy Shackelford as secretary in charge of publications services a month earlier, the national office acquired two staff members who, with Leslie, would continue to serve the Association with increasing responsibilities during its remaining years as ACPRA.[129]

Although the IRS had by its ruling of 1960 classified ACPRA as a nonprofit organization, the Association was still being held accountable for excise taxes. At their meeting in December the Trustees directed the executive vice president to seek relief from these taxes. The exemption was granted by IRS in July, 1964,[130] and in 1965 the U.S. Treasury became an ACPRA "benefactor" by refunding $1,044 in telephone taxes paid during the three years before the exemption was granted.[131]

In addition to moving toward a realignment of districts, ACPRA took action in 1963-64 to phase out its three councils and give the districts greater representation on the Board of Trustees. The committee headed by Denison to consider council relationships within the Association recommended abolition of the councils and appointment of commissions by the trustees for such interest areas as public relations, management, financial support, recruitment and training, and research. The committee also recommended revision of the method of electing trustees, so that those formerly elected by councils would be selected by districts with one trustee named to the board for each 100 member institutions or fraction thereof in a district. The trustees in December revised the Denison committee's plan so that each district would have one place on the board for each fifty members or fraction thereof, rather than for each 100. By mail vote the membership approved, 302 to

2, bylaw changes eliminating the councils as of July 31, 1964, and providing for the election by districts, after September 1, of those trustees formerly elected by councils.[132]

First of a series of steps meant to provide a sounder budgetary base for ACPRA's financial operations were also taken by the trustees at their December meeting. New billing and accounting systems were adopted and a decision made to seek a bylaw revision changing the fiscal year. At this time the fiscal year ran from August 1 through July 31. The proposed bylaw revision would make the year start September 1 and end August 31, thus solving certain bookkeeping problems. The national office was authorized to shift annual billing of membership dues to the month of September in the future. Thus members, beginning in September, 1964, would be billed on a pro rata basis as their dues expired and by September, 1965, all institutions would be on an annual billing basis. The accounting system adopted also duplicated that used by AAC, thus making the two associations alike in still another area of operations.[133]

Most important of the finance-related changes made in 1963-64 was that in the fee structure. After months of study and discussion, the Executive Committee in April initiated a complete overhaul of fees with the intention of providing funds needed for expanded services in the years immediately ahead. Based on enrollment as they had been since 1961, the fees proposed (with those currently charged shown in parentheses) were to become effective at the beginning of the 1964-65 fiscal year as follows if given approval of the Board of Trustees during the 1964 convention: Institutions with enrollment up to 499, $100 ($50), covering one member representative; 500-999, $150 ($100), two member representatives; 1,000-4,999, $200 ($125), three member representatives; over 5,000, $250 ($150), four representatives. Fees for educational associates and subscribers were advanced to $150 for two member representatives as compared to $100 in the past. It was also proposed that fees for additional representatives in all categories be jumped to $50 from the former $15.

At its April meeting the Executive Committee learned that the Board of Trustees had adopted by a mail ballot new dues regulations governing multi-campus institutions, most of whom had been paying only $15 for member representatives from campuses located in areas other than their main campus. For dues and voting purposes under the new regulations, any institution would be considered a separate entity and assessed the full membership fee based on its enrollment if its campus was located outside of the immediate geographical area of the parent institution. Professional school units were not included in this interpretation.[134]

The Board of Trustees at its meeting in Los Angeles on July 4 adopted the proposed schedule with one exception. The fee for extra member representatives was set at $35 instead of $50. In recognition of special difficulties faced by the three multi-university systems affiliated with ACPRA at this time, the trustees also voted that their dues for 1964-65 only should be assessed at one-half the new institutional membership rate.[135]

Commenting on the revised fee structure at the Association's annual business meeting July 7, Executive Vice President Leslie said: "The revised fee structure was a conative decision by the Board of Trustees, based upon the most equitable distribution of the cost to maintain and improve upon the operation thus far so capably advanced. If ACPRA is worth perpetuating, it is worth perpetuating only if its objectives and methods of operation are consistent with the highest aspirations of its member institutions. We have no desire to waste the time and dollars of hundreds of colleges and universities in a make-do, 'along for the ride' operation. ACPRA is no end in itself, but only a catalyst for people dedicated to improving understanding and support of higher education. This is an organization for serious-minded people who have a professional attitude and approach to their work."[136]

The need for increased income had become apparent as the Executive Committee struggled to keep the 1963-64 budget out of the red. Meanwhile, a Long-Range Planning Committee headed by Arthur J.

Schaefer was mapping an expanded program which would take the Association through 1967, its golden anniversary year. At a meeting held just prior to the Chicago convention the Executive Committee had approved a budget of $175,000 for 1963-64, but at a meeting of the committee in Pittsburgh on October 5-6 this had been revised downward to $170,500, some $50,000 under the Association's spending of the preceding year. When the year ended on July 31, however, the financial report showed that income for 1963-64 had been $182,717 and expenses were $185,296. It was the third time in as many years that expenses had exceeded income. The Association's assets and net worth had dropped from $50,512 in 1961 to $14,688.[137]

Workshops of the type ACPRA had been sponsoring in recent years were held under the aegis of the districts in several areas in 1963-64 and the Association itself concentrated on three expected to attract national interest. First of these was a conference on "Pressures '64" held in Washington December 8-10 with 125 participants focusing attention on major issues in education and their implications for college public relations, development, and administration. With the executive officers of a dozen major educational organizations, federal offices, and colleges as speakers, this conference discussed such subjects as the expansion of knowledge, greater student demands, teaching technology advances, the federal government's role, mass communications, changing organizational patterns in colleges and universities, and financial implications and responsibility. Joint sponsors were ACPRA's three councils, now in their last year of activity.

With registration limited to 100, the Association's first workshop dealing exclusively with life income and annuity contracts was held in Washington May 3-5. Sponsored by the Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy headed by Roland Matthies, it was conducted on a case study basis for persons already familiar with the basic principles of life income and annuity contracts. However, a preliminary session was structured to give beginners a "foundation" for the rest of the workshop.[138]

Taking up the sequence started in 1959 but interrupted in 1963, ACPRA's Development Institute for 1964 was held in Denver for six days in August. The program was designed for newcomers to the field of institutional public relations and development. Attendance was to have been limited to fifty individuals to give each participant ample time for personal consultation with members of the faculty, but interest in the program was so widespread that sixty-seven persons were finally admitted.

ACPRA's publications program was expanded in 1963-64 with the creation of *Education Abstracts* as well as the *Placement Newsletter* previously mentioned. The first issue of *Education Abstracts*, which came to be regarded by members as one of the Association's major services, appeared in October, 1963, with announcement that it would be published ten times a year. Growing out of the Publications Section of *College and University Journal* and earlier resumes in the *Newsletter*, it was "designed to help busy members of the Association keep abreast of printed material in the field of higher education by providing quick and ready reference to articles, books, and special publications." Prepared by Richard W. Smith, editor of *College and University Journal*, the informal newsletter of six pages contained brief descriptions—and sometimes quick evaluations—of articles appearing in both the popular and the professional press.[139]

"Education has become a matter of intense discussion in the public mass media, and the number and scope of the professional education journals have expanded enormously in the last ten years," Executive Vice President Leslie said in a letter accompanying the first issue. "It has become increasingly difficult for the conscientious college or university administrator to keep up with the literature in his field. With these facts in mind, perhaps ACPRA may be excused for adding yet another publication to your desk. The enclosed first issue of *Education Abstracts* is designed to serve as a guide to the literature now being published on the general subject of higher education. . . . The brief paragraphs will sometimes supply condensations of the articles noted but, more frequently, will simply indicate the contents of the materials. Occasionally, a critical comment will be interjected."[140]

Research reports on a variety of subjects, an in-depth examination of college publications, and articles on fund raising and various areas of public relations by authorities in their fields were features of the year in the *College and University Journal*.

In a detailed study of the contents of the education sections of *Time* and *Newsweek*, Harvey Jacobson, director of the news bureau at the University of North Dakota, discovered some interesting trends between 1933 and 1960. Whereas administrators had been the source of 40.2 percent of the educational news printed by the magazines in 1933, they supplied only 28.9 percent of that appearing in 1960. On the other hand, students had become the source of 10.5 percent of the stories in 1960 as compared to just under four percent in 1933. Subject matter treated had also changed steadily over the twenty-seven-year-period. Stories on aims, purposes, and policy changes increased from 15.5 percent in 1933 to 21.1 percent in 1960. The magazines in 1933 carried nothing related to segregation and race relations. In 1960 they devoted nearly nine percent of their educational pieces to this subject. Attention to conduct, behavior, and discipline had declined steadily, from 20.7 percent in 1933 to just over three percent in 1960. So, too, had that devoted to academic freedom, from 10.3 percent to less than three percent.[141]

A statement by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching crediting Charles W. Eliot of Harvard with initiating advertising in higher education in 1870 piqued the curiousity of Arthur H. Glogan, a postdoctoral student in the School of Education at Stanford University. The result was a well-documented and sometimes amusing article on "Advertising Higher Education."[142] Presenting or quoting from the actual advertisements, Glogan showed that there "was indeed an abundance of advertising in higher education prior to 1870." The Greek sophists, he found, had been the first to use advertising. But in America, Princeton [known as The Colledge in New Jersey in its early days] was the first when it placed notices of its opening in the New York *Gazette and Post Boy* five times in April and May, 1747. Kings College (Columbia) and Queens College (Rutgers) carried similar advertisements in New York papers shortly thereafter.

Advertisements seeking financial support were also used frequently by colleges after 1749. In that year, Princeton sponsored the first of several lotteries it held while that method of money raising was still legal. Glogan's article showed that while Princeton was the first institution to sponsor a lottery, it was by no means the last. In 1767 Brown University held a lottery "toward furnishing the Parsonage House belonging to the Baptist Church of Warren, and rendering it Commodious for the Reception of Pupils, who are, or shall be, placed there, for a liberal education."

One issue of *College and University Journal* was enlivened by a debate (in nine pages) between David F. Behrendt, education reporter for the Milwaukee *Journal*, and Elbert Chance, director of alumni and public relations at the University of Delaware.[143]

"Education is sacred," Behrendt declared, "and because it is, institutions and individuals engaged in the business of education cannot be sacred. If the newspaper is to perform its responsibility to the pubic, educational institutions must be covered with all the aggressive probing and innate skepticism on the part of the reporter as characterizes the best police and court reporters or political analysts. . . .

"When a newspaper is working on a story that is proving embarassing to a college, too often the institution's officials refuse to talk. In the process they do themselves more damage than if they had talked. An informed college administration should be able to anticipate how the press must act. The administration should know that a good newspaper will be determined to carry a story on the issue or controversy in question and carry it *that day*. Much as the newspaper might dislike doing so, it probably will carry a one-sided story if a one-sided story is all it can get. Need I repeat an old principle of public relations: Tell your own story or someone else will tell it for you. Nothing takes the wind out of the sails of a potential critic more than an open admission of a mistake made. And nothing seems to give the critic more ammunition than the school administrator who refuses to talk, or worse denies the mistake and later is forced to admit not only a mistake but also a lie."

Chance criticized the tendency of some newspapers to be condescending toward the college public relations man and his function. He condemned the newspapers' "inconsiderate pressure to provide information to meet deadlines," the "ridiculous newspaper practice . . . of evaluating everything in terms of dollars," and "occasions when a reporter's personal prejudices influences his treatment of an issue."

"I believe newspapermen, like the rest of us, have much to learn," Chance concluded. "They should own up to their occasional mistakes in the same typeface and prominent location in which the errors appeared, rather than hiding the six point, 'The editors regret . . .' between the Firestone tire and Schlitz beer ads on page thirty-seven. Occasionally, at least, they should abandon the easy road of tradition and transitory excitement for the more difficult path of exploration and solid accomplishment. They will show progress when they admit that all good stories are not controversial and that, indeed, some stories are not worthy of being printed because their publication only adds lustre and importance to events not worthy of praise or attention. Finally, newsmen should learn, if they have not realized already, that college public relations men are interested in working cooperatively with them in a mature partnership to tell accurately and well the important story of higher education."

The matter of name change, which had caused ACPRA and its members a great deal of distress since 1960, received only minor attention during 1963-64. At a meeting in conjunction with the Chicago conference in June, 1963, the Executive Committee had decided that a factual review of steps taken to date toward a name change should be prepared for distribution to all attending district meetings or as a part of district newsletters, that districts should allow time for discussion of the name change at their meetings, and that districts be asked to return suggested names and comments following their meetings. Then at its meetings early in October the Executive Committee agreed that the name change should be discussed but not stressed at district meetings and that no effort would be made to seek adoption of a new name during the current year.[144]

In his report at the 1964 conference Leslie commented on "the external calm this year in the absence of any more name-change pyrotechnics." "Not always one to leave well enough alone," he said, "I'd like to suggest that a new name, truly descriptive of the purposes and objectives of the Association, will be suggested and accepted by the membership only after we know what we are and what we stand for. Let's be more concerned for what we accomplish collectively rather than for what we're called collectively."[145]

In accordance with the long-range planning policy for annual conferences, the Executive Committee at meetings in October, April, and July gave attention to conferences of the next five years, including those of 1968 and 1969, supposedly to be held with AAC. Dates for the 1965 convention to be held in Cincinnati were changed to July 5-8 to facilitate travel of member representatives during the holiday period and Michael Radock of the University of Michigan, and John A. Moser of Xavier University were named program chairman and conference coordinator, respectively.[146] The same dates in 1966 were selected for the Boston conference and John S. Bailey of Northeastern University was named chairman for local arrangements.[147] Dallas was selected as the site of the fiftieth anniversary conference in 1967.[148]

Meanwhile, plans were being completed for the 1964 conference to be held in Los Angeles on July 5-8, with planning in the hands of Patrick Nicholson of the University of Houston and a committee of five.[149] "Education '64—Unity From Diversity" was chosen as the theme and the committee structured a program meant to probe deeply into major issues facing higher education as they related to the public relations, financial support, and management functions at all types of institutions. Nicholson's committee decided to use a new format for the last three days of the conference. The first day was devoted to a district officers' workshop, special sessions for Jesuit colleges, Protestant colleges, state universities and land-grant colleges, and a western buffet followed by the presidential address, presentation of Honors Competition awards, a program for newcomers, and institutional movies. Each of the last three days opened with a general session at which a speaker viewed a current problem as it related to the entire spectrum of higher education. On the first and third of the three days a three-man panel then discussed the general session topic as it related to public relations, financial support, and management. Finally, the delegates took a more specific look at the general session topic in ten sessions for various types of institutions. In addition to the general session, the second of the three days included two special addresses, the annual business meeting, concurrent sessions on twelve practical problems being faced by ACPRA members, and the annual banquet. The conference closed with a workshop centered on winning entries in the Honors Competition of the year.[150]

The Honors Competition for 1964 was the largest yet sponsored by ACPRA. Entries totaled 796 in the publications category and ninety-one in the public relations, financial support, and program management categories. Two major policy changes had been made for entries submitted, the first calling for a fee of $5 for each first entry and $2 for each additional entry, and the second calling for all entries except those in the publications category to include a comprehensive case study of the project, preceded by a summary statement of approximately 250 words. Announcement had been made in April that the Sears, Roebuck Foundation was making a $2,500 gift to provide $100 incentive grants for each institution receiving a certificate of exceptional achievement. Any portion of the $2,500 remaining after grants had been awarded the winners was to be used for the Lending Library.[151] All entries were to become the property of ACPRA which planned to make them a part of the library. Certificates of exceptional achievement, each with a $100 incentive grant, were awarded for thirteen of the entries. Seventy-seven other entries received certificates of special merit.

Three awards, including the first ever made to honor a president of the nation, were conferred at the conference. Remembering the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy as "a friend of higher education," ACPRA made a memorial award which read in part: "John Fitzgerald Kennedy had many interests; primary among them was a dedicated concern that the benefits of higher education be made available to many more of our young Americans, and through them to the nation.

"With characteristic energy, the late President worked faithfully and effectively to bring about legislation and procedures designed to assist institutions of higher education in carrying out their increasingly difficult missions. Typical of the major projects into which he poured many hours of personal attention was the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and related measures. Although signed into law after his passing, this act as Public Law 88-204 remains, in the words of President Lyndon B. Johnson, a monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy's abiding determination that the opportunities inherent in a better education be made available to a far wider segment of his fellow countrymen."

The other awards went to Mrs. Edith Green, Congresswoman from Oregon, and William M. Pinkerton, news officer at Harvard University since 1947. Mrs. Green, a leader in securing the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and other legislative action beneficial to higher education, received ACPRA's award for distinguished service "in recognition of her outstanding leadership to advance the cause of higher education in this country." The Association's award for outstanding achievement went to Pinkerton in recognition of "his leadership, judgment, intellectual honesty, and competence in helping to advance the cause of higher education."[152]

Mrs. Green could not be present for the awards banquet but President Hewlett made a trip to Washington later to make the persentation in her office.

The last major act of ACPRA's Board of Trustees for 1963-64 on July 4 was acceptance of the report in which Leslie, working with the Planning Committee headed by Arthur Schaefer, had built a three-year plan encompassing every phase of the Association's activity. The plan, covering the period of 1964-67, included projections of budgetary requirements, publication services, conferences, workshops, institutes, study commissions, and other related services. Basic elements involved were: (1) the establishment of immediate and long-term objectives of the Association; (2) a revised fee basis, more equitable and relative to the demands of the membership and the future; (3) a simultaneous annual billing system; (4) a change in the fiscal year to September through August to reflect better the actual operation of the Association; (5) elimination of the practice of multicampus institutions paying only one membership fee and thereby eroding the financial base; (6) consolidation of district boundaries into nine stronger districts better able to operate successful conferences and other programs; (7) increased program and services for the entire membership; and (8) more efficient business procedures to conserve manpower and funds.[153]

Groundwork for this three-year program had been laid by the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees the preceding December when they approved the simultaneous annual billing system and authorized Leslie to take steps aimed at eventual change in the fiscal year. The trustees had also at that time taken action to classify fee policies for multicampus institutions and these were formalized later by a mail vote by board members. The three-year plan as outlined by Schaefer's committee then called for five day-and-a-half or two-day institutes to be held each year on the same major topic in five different regions of the country. Objectives of these national institutes would be in-depth examination of a particular problem in educational public relations and development and addition of quality contributions to the literature in the field.

At the April meeting the Executive Committee had also "approved in principle recommendations for programming of national conferences, district conferences, and summer institutes. These included: (1) a broad approach in programming for the national conference featuring outstanding speakers on major educational issues and designed to broaden the perspective of those attending; (2) district conference emphasis on regional programs and problems (along with district workshops), and concentration on the 'how-to' approach with sessions designed for both new and seasoned personnel; and (3) summer institutes on public relations and development sponsored or co-sponsored by ACPRA in two or three parts of the country each year for newer people in the field."[154]

In its final session on July 4, ACPRA's Board of Trustees for 1963-64 elected Patrick Nicholson as a trustee-at-large for a three-year term. Three hours later, at the first meeting of the Board of Trustees for 1964-65, he was named president-elect of the Association. James H. Denison, president-elect for the past year, was formally advanced to the presidency and Dyar Massey was named secretary-treasurer for the second time. Others elected to serve on the Executive Committee were Fred C. Hess of Grinnell College, Willard Hunter of Claremont Graduate School and University Center, and Lester B. Whetten of Brigham Young University.

The trustees at this meeting also made Hewlett chairman of the ACPRA group serving on the ACPRA-AAC Liaison Committee for 1964-65, voted to continue study of the name change but not place change in a priority position for 1964-65, and moved to give greater status to the increasingly important Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy. They voted that the committee be composed of seven members elected for three-year terms and eligible for reappointment for one additional term. Roland Matthies of Wittenberg, head of the committee since its creation early in Russell Bintzer's administration, was continued as chairman.[155]

"Our problems are new and different. Our challenges are greater— but so are our opportunities," Horace Hewlett told his ACPRA colleagues as he wound up his year in the presidency. "Only yesterday 'general education' and 'student apathy' were topics of wide discussion. Today such subjects, though interesting and still discussed, pale in significance before the compelling questions all Americans—in and out of education—must ponder."

"At no time in our history," he declared, "has the spark of opportunity been more susceptible to being kindled into flame than the present . . . . Last fall the late President Kennedy spoke at Amherst . . . and in closing I should like to quote from his remarks. The President noted the economic advantages private colleges and universities tend to give their students. 'But,' he cautioned, 'in return for the great opportunity society gives the graduates of this and related schools, it seems to me incumbent upon this and other schools' graduates to recognize their responsibility to the public interest. Privilege is here and with privilege goes responsibility . . . . Private colleges, taken as a whole, draw fifty percent of their students from the wealthiest ten percent of our nation. And even state universities and other public institutions derive twenty-five percent of their students from this group. In March, 1962, persons of eighteen years or older who had not completed high school made up forty-six percent of the labor force, and such persons comprised sixty-four percent of those who were unemployed . . . . There is inherited wealth in this country and also inherited poverty. And unless the graduates of this college and other colleges like it are willing to put back into our society those talents, the broad sympathy, the understanding, the compassion, unless they are willing to put those qualities back into the service of the Great Republic, then obviously the presuppositions upon which our democracy is based are bound to be fallible.' "[156]

Progress in Liaison With AAC

Few men have been known to chase a pair of criminals on foot, then capture them with nothing more deadly than an inoperative, unloaded pistol. But Spike Denison, ACPRA's president in 1964-65, did just that one night near Mansfield, Ohio. "I didn't know the thing wasn't loaded," Denison declared weakly after the audacity of his act had been discovered.

Unless it was his escape from Nazi breakthrough forces during the Battle of the Bulge, Denison's experience with the two law breakers was admittedly the most exciting of his life. It had taken place during summer work with the old corn borer patrol of the U. S. Department of Agriculture while he was still in his teens. While manning a road block one night, he started chasing a blockade crasher he thought was a teen-age hot rodder. After the fugitive car crashed into a ditch, Denison discovered that he had in fact been chasing two jail breakers.

And few men have risen to the presidency of ACPRA with wider experience in journalism and public relations than that possessed by James Henry Denison. While still in elementary school, he started in newspaper work as a cleanup boy in the mechanical department of his hometown weekly in Mt. Sterling, Ohio. Later he learned the printing trade, from setting stick type to running the job presses. While serving as correspondent for the Defiance, Ohio, daily during his college days, Denison chose the editorial side of newspapering as a career. In the following fifteen years he was a sports writer, general assignment reporter, copy reader, financial editor, and news editor for papers in Defiance, Toledo, and Detroit, then a staff correspondent for *Business Week*.[157]

It was while he was serving on the copy desk at the Detroit *Free Press* that Denison got the nickname which stuck with him the rest of his life. The editorial department had three men named James, and as might be expected all were called Jim. Often, when the editor called, all three would answer; at other times none would with the belief that the summons was for one of the others. Denison, who always liked to keep things in order, finally solved the situation, so far as he was concerned, by saying, "Why not call me Spike?"[158]

For two years before entering the Army in 1943, Denison was director of information for the Michigan Defense Council. Much of his time during two years as a lieutenant in Europe he was liaison officer for the press correspondents. Out of the Army, Denison became administrative assistant to Michigan Governor Harry F. Kelly until he accepted a similar post with Michigan State's President John A. Hannah, starting January 1, 1947. In the latter post he oversaw State's expanding public relations activities and staff, established the university press, helped the university establish the first college television station east of the Mississippi, and became one of the best speech writers in the college field.[159]

"Few surpass Jim as a speech writer," one of his long-time associates commented in 1967. "He has a great talent for manipulating words so that they sound good and are meaningful when spoken by a second party."[160]

Active in ACPRA since 1947, Denison had been one of the first to see the need for greater emphasis on the problems of administrators in the field. His leadership led to the establishment of the Administration Section when sections were a major part of the Association's structure, and he served as first chairman for the group. From that time, 1959, until he became president, he was a member of the Association's Board of Trustees, with committee assignments of major importance.

Much of Denison's time during his year in the presidency was devoted to efforts meant to assure closer and lasting beneficial ties with the American Alumni Council—and the efforts for nearly eight months seemed destined to end in frustration. The year had begun with high hopes for the long-sought cooperative efforts between AAC and ACPRA whose programs were now overlapping in several major areas and especially in programs planned for the annual convention conference. Soon after the Los Angeles conference adjourned, however, rumors began seeping back that AAC at its national convention in July had decided against the alternate-year plan for future conventions.

When no official word had been received by early August, Denison wrote Beatrice Field of Tulane University, president of AAC, saying that "the indirect reports I have of your deliberations in Denver leave me slightly confused as to the state of relationships between AAC and ACPRA." Declaring that he was "disquieted by the indirect report that your board disapproved the joint recommendation of our liaison committees," Denison wrote, "I think I should add that I would be deeply disappointed personally, and I know a majority of our members would share that disappointment, if I were to learn that the possibility of meeting together each year has been foreclosed. Hence, I shall await anxiously your assurance on this point."[161]

In her reply, Miss Field echoed Denison's satisfaction over the fact that AAC and ACPRA would be getting together in a number of district meetings during the year. Then she added, "However, the national conference situation still is unresolved so far as a joint meeting is concerned. . . . Our board at the Denver meeting voted not to have a joint conference in 1968."

She pointed out that minutes of the Joint Liaison Committee* for the meeting held the preceding April had merely indicated hope for the establishment of alternate-year, cooperatively-planned conferences starting in 1968, and that it had been agreed that "both boards would discuss the matter at their summer meetings and that the national offices would then proceed with the resultant plan."

The AAC president suggested that, since the hotel in which her organization would be meeting in Miami Beach was near other available hotels, ACPRA might wish to consider a simultaneous or tandem conference. "I want to emphasize," she wrote, "that our board wishes to pursue further any areas of cooperation between the two organizations and I think that our Liaison Committee is prepared to do just this."[162]

---

*Readers should remember that ACPRA and AAC each had its own Liaison Committee as the two organizations discussed mutual interests and problems, but that these committees, when meeting together, were also called Liaison Committee, and sometimes Merger Committee, but most often Joint Liaison Committee.

On August 27 Denison replied to Miss Field, expressing his disappointment over the decision of the AAC board not to meet with ACPRA in a national conference in 1968. He quoted verbatim from minutes of ACPRA's board meeting of July 4 indicating that reaffirmation had been given the ACPRA recommendation "that responsibility for national conferences be shared on an alternate-year basis with AAC beginning in 1968, in order that only one conference be held each year with programs designed to serve the membership of both associations." He also expressed belief that work of the Liaison Committee now "takes on added importance," and indicated hope that it would meet again "as soon as possible."[163]

In a letter dated September 30 Miss Field inquired about the feasibility of a liaison meeting in New Orleans in late January. ACPRA's Executive Committee, meeting in East Lansing October 4-5, expressed unanimous opinion that matters needing to be discussed were so pressing that the Liaison Committee "should not wait so long to give attention to them." Denison, in a letter to Miss Field on October 6, pointed out that several of ACPRA's district conferences were scheduled before the time suggested for the Liaison Committee meeting and that members attending "will expect and deserve a report on developments."[164]

To assure complete and accurate information concerning ACPRA-AAC relationships of the past, Denison asked Leslie to draw a chronological summary of these relationships, to be used by President-elect Nicholson and himself as they addressed district meetings. The summary, completed in mid-November, showed that cooperative efforts had grown extensively since Francis C. Pray and Loren Hickerson, presidents of ACPRA and AAC, respectively, had in the fall of 1954 initiated several conferences which aired common problems and suggested the establishment of a permanent liaison committee. The fund-raising area "had become a battle ground for increased membership and influence of the two associations" between 1955 and 1957 and hope was expressed "that some of the divisive language could be toned down." Possibilities for amalgamation, by federation if not merger, had come up almost annually, although AAC in 1959 had passed a resolution expressing conviction that it "can best carry on its work and render its most effective service to education as an independent organization." Since ACPRA had reorganized its structure in 1961 in accordance with recommendations made by its Study Commission, discussions related to cooperative efforts by the two associations had concentrated on national and district conferences, workshops, lending library, and placement services.[165]

"In compiling the chronological summary," Leslie wrote to Denison, Nicholson, and Hewlett, the immediate past president serving as chairman of ACPRA's representatives on the Joint Liaison Committee, "the one thing that impressed me was the restraint and statesmanship exercised by ACPRA leadership in all of its previous negotiations with the AAC regardless of how frustrating they may have been at the moment. I believe it would do us well to continue this exemplary conduct."

Leslie also suggested that it might be valuable for ACPRA to call a meeting in New York of past presidents of the last ten years plus a few key persons especially knowledgeable concerning negotiations with AAC. Taking advantage of the fact that several past presidents of earlier years were scheduled to be in New York at that time, a meeting was arranged for December 15.[166]

As a result of this meeting, it was decided that the ACPRA members on the Joint Liaison Committee would submit a report to the Association's Board of Trustees including a brief summary of ACPRA-AAC relationships of recent years. It would emphasize: (1) the long-range view that a union of forces was inevitable; (2) the belief that some form of federation was desirable; and (3) a recommendation that a joint study commission be established and empowered to draw up procedures for closer cooperation and organization. The report would also be sent to all members of ACPRA and to AAC members of the Joint Liaison Committee.[167] To make certain that members of ACPRA were fully informed and had opportunity to ask questions, it was also determined that Denison and Nicholson should include, in any presentations made at district conferences, such information on ACPRA-AAC relations as they deemed valuable.

"Our members," Denison wrote in his memo to the Board of Trustees, "are entitled to know the whole story of our repeated efforts to establish a closer working relationship with AAC and they are entitled to know the lines along which we are continuing to work. This information is of vital importance in view of the many unfair criticisms of ACPRA for the failure of the two organizations to eliminate what appears to many observers to be a needless duplication of activities with consequent waste of time, money, and energy. With this document, we hope to clarify the intent of ACPRA and signify its willingness to go more than half way to achieve a goal which we consider consonant with the best interests of higher education in the United States."[168]

The report, prepared for ACPRA's entire membership by the Association's members on the Joint Liaison Committee, traced the efforts made to effect greater cooperation between the two organizations in the last decade, with an indication of successes and failures. "These facts are not recorded to condemn or malign our colleagues in the AAC," the report emphasized. "Rather," the memo concluded, "it is made to the membership of ACPRA by its Liaison Committee in the discharge of what it assumes to be its responsibility: namely, an accounting of its activities during the past year and a clarification of its position.

"With the many overlapping interests, responsibilities, and memberships of the two organizations, it seems clear to ACPRA's Liaison Committee—and to its trustees and Executive Committee—that, in behalf of our member institutions and higher education, a more realistic coordination of money, time, and effort must be effected. Neither organization would lose, nor would it gain at the expense of the other, if greater cooperation were extended in areas already defined. . . .

"Along with many members of ACPRA, we hold that delay in meeting problems can only increase such tension and misunderstanding that now exist. We have no intention of offending our good friends in the AAC, but solutions cannot be found through inactivity. We stand ready to resume discussions in the Joint Liaison Committee as soon as possible to consider the long-range course of both organizations. It is certainly our intention to continue our efforts toward the goal of greater coordination, cooperation, and understanding between ACPRA and AAC in the future."[169]

At January conferences of four ACPRA districts, two of them held jointly with AAC districts, Denison and Nicholson elaborated on actions taken in recent years to effect greater cooperation and coordination with AAC. Both pointed out that college presidents and business managers were questioning increasingly the cost of maintaining institutional memberships in organizations whose services to their members were duplicative in various ways.

"Consolidation and coordination are the order of the day in education," Denison declared in his address. "Being in public higher education, I am perhaps unduly sensitive to public impatience with senseless rivalry among colleges and universities, and more keenly aware that the uncouth practice of knocking heads together is not unknown in the Groves of Academe. I doubt if ACPRA and AAC enjoy any special immunity, and I would prefer working out our own accommodations to having them worked out for us by others who might not be as sensitive as we to our professional needs and aspirations. . . .

"But these, I submit, are relatively narrow technical considerations," Denison said after commenting on the overlapping efforts of ACPRA and AAC in fund raising and publications work. "Far more important, in my opinion, is that we in ACPRA and AAC are united in purpose, however much our specific individual responsibilities may differ. Our common purpose is to advance the cause of higher education by increasing public understanding and support. In this we are as one. This argues mightily for an arrangement under which we can exert our combined strengths with a minimum of wastage, whether it be of time, money, or energy. All other considerations, be they professional or personal, must be subordinated. They are, in fact, secondary to the main challenge, which is to find ways to do our several jobs more efficiently, more effectively, and more economically."[170]

No other date was proposed for the joint liaison meeting until late January. At that time George Cooke, executive director of AAC, suggested to John Leslie that a meeting be scheduled for February 24. Horace Hewlett, chairman of the ACPRA group, expressed the willingness of his fellows to meet at that time and suggested that an agenda be prepared with alternate-year national meetings, realignment of districts, and a joint placement service as top priority items.[171]

Hewlett's suggestions were made in a letter to Verne Stadtman, immediate past president of AAC, after the latter had informed him that AAC's Board of Directors had completed a survey of member attitudes toward alternate-year conferences. Because earlier attempts to assess the opinion of AAC-members had been inconclusive, Stadtman wrote, the AAC Board had authorized a membership-wide survey by mail.

"This was a very careful study," Stadtman said, "conducted over a period of several months. . . . In response to the results of that survey, the board has acted on an experimental basis to invite members of ACPRA to the AAC general conference in 1968 and to take such steps as may be required to include programming for ACPRA members. The board voted also to defer plans for the 1969 general conference in anticipation that ACPRA would reciprocate the 1968 pattern in that year." Stadtman expressed belief that action of the AAC board made a meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee desirable as soon as possible and voiced hope that it could be held on February 24.[172]

While Stadtman was writing Hewlett, Miss Field, having received copies of the addresses presented at district meetings by Denison and Nicholson, and of the memo sent to ACPRA members by the Association's Liaison Committee, wrote Denison with some indication of irritation.

"I believe you should know that we find these actions by ACPRA less than palatable and certainly not constructive," she wrote the ACPRA president on February 10. "It is difficult to reconcile the statements that have been made with your expressed desire for cooperation. In the light of my comments, I suppose it would not be illogical to ask for cessation of such statements. I shall not do that. Instead, I would like to leave to your own judgment what future measures on the part of ACPRA might best insure that the proposed meeting of our Liaison Committee may be conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence. I believe that only on such a basis can we have meaningful discussions."[173]

Indicating some astonishment, Denison said in a reply to Miss Field written February 16: "Surely you would not presume to question the propriety of my reporting to our institutional representatives on a matter of major concern to the American College Public Relations Association, or the propriety of a report to them of our Liaison Committee. I must assume, therefore, that it is not these actions that you find 'impalatable', but the contents of the reports. If there are errors of fact, we shall be happy to correct them. Errors of conclusion would be more difficult to establish, subjective judgments being involved, but here, too, we are quite willing to acknowledge any demonstrable mistakes. . . . Whether these actions have been constructive remains for future determination on the basis of subsequent developments. But I trust you will grant that the ACPRA has stated clearly its concerns and its position in a situation not always marked by candor and full disclosure. It seems to me that such frankness is essential to the establishment of the mutual respect and confidence both of us desire."[174]

Cooke on February 15 mailed to AAC's membership a summary of the opinion survey his Board of Directors had conducted concerning general conferences and with it the statement the directors had drawn at their New Orleans meeting January 30-31. The survey had indeed been comprehensive and the results were presented in thirteen tables showing opinions on the basis of such things as joint membership in AAC and ACPRA, type of AAC membership held, district membership, size of alumni body, length of time membership had been held in AAC, number of AAC national conferences attended, number of district conferences attended, etc.

Of AAC's 2,232 individual members, 1,422 had voted and of these 550 were also members of ACPRA. Members were asked to vote on four options—AAC national conferences every year, AAC national conferences every other year, alternating AAC and ACPRA conferences with no special programming, and alternating AAC and ACPRA national conferences with programming by the sponsoring organization for the special types included in the other organization. Of the 1,422 who voted 922 favored national conferences held with ACPRA, and of this number 656 favored conferences at which the sponsoring organization would include on its program sessions for the special types of the other organization. Of the 550 individuals voting as members of both organizations, 425 favored joint national conferences, and of these 331 favored conferences for which the sponsoring organization would program with the special types of the other association in mind. AAC's members were divided into eleven interest types and all of them favored joint conferences.[175]

One paragraph in the statement of ACC's Board of Directors to the membership showed some irritation concerning the recent report members of ACPRA's Liaison Committee had made to that association's membership. It read: "In recent years ACPRA has been increasingly insistent on merging with AAC or finding some form of federation with us. We have cooperated with them when such action seemed consistent with our purpose, but have not gone as far or as fast as they hoped. They have recently reported to their members on this history, stating that merger or federation is essential, and chiding us for not accepting it."

In a later paragraph the statement set down the basis for continued cooperation with ACPRA in these words: ". . . we consider that ACPRA has, over its long existence, had a different, but valid, sense of purpose, and that cooperation between the two organizations, in whatever degree, should be judged not as a necessary end in itself but in the light of whether it serves and sustains the purposes of each organization. Our Liaison Committee will continue discussions with its ACPRA counterpart within this framework."[176]

Discussion of the alternate-year conference plan was the first order of business when the AAC and ACPRA Liaison Committees met at Brookings Institution in Washington on February 24 with Denison, Hewlett, Nicholson, and Leslie representing ACPRA and Miss Field, Stadtman, Cooke, Alan W. McCarthy, and Raymond L. Finehart representing AAC. An agreement, according to Denison, was reached "amicably and quickly."[177] It was based on a motion the AAC Board of Directors had passed January 31: "That the American Alumni Council plan to hold its 1968 conference as a conference to which members of ACPRA will be invited and for which programs of interest to ACPRA will be developed. It is further moved that the AAC defer plans for its 1969 conference in anticipation that the ACPRA will invite members of AAC to its conference in that year and plan programs for AAC members." During a discussion of conference-related subjects which followed it was decided that: (1) AAC would appoint a general conference chairman who would work with Leslie to set up programs for ACPRA members; (2) AAC would be responsible for all expenses of the 1968 conference and would retain all income; (3) the 1968 conference would be considered an AAC conference (with members of ACPRA invited) and that the 1969 conference would be an ACPRA conference (with AAC members invited); (4) July 14-18 were the most desirable dates for 1968 with July 7-11 second choices; (5) Cooke and Leslie would review meeting sites of the two organizations for the past fifteen years after which ACPRA would try to choose for 1969 a site that would not closely duplicate that of recent conferences of either organization; (6) arrangements relative to programming and finances for the 1969 conference would parallel those for 1968 with ACPRA taking responsibility; (7) annual conferences for 1970 and after "might follow the same pattern, if found to be satisfactory, or the two organizations might go their separate ways."[178]

Having settled questions related to national conferences, the Joint Liaison Committee turned its attention to other matters with the discussion becoming "quite unpleasant at times."[179] Cooke, AAC's executive director serving as secretary *pro tem* for the meeting, covered this part of the conference with these three paragraphs:

"Full and frank disclosure was made by members of both committees on many points at issue but in the opinion of the undersigned 'secretary' no useful purpose is served by any attempt to record the conversation either verbatim or in essence—the latter having the added hazard of personal interpretation and language, a factor which may well account for at least some of the difficulties themselves.

"Suffice it then to say that there was once more ample evidence of the trouble and misunderstanding that can ensue from the recurring problem of imperfect communications. The air was cleared and a basis laid for constructive action in an atmosphere of mutual confidence.

"To guard against future incidents resulting from lack of unified interpretation and understanding of the Liaison Committee's discussions, Mr. Stadtman suggested that the following motion passed by the AAC Board of Directors be adopted as a guideline: 'That the [AAC] Board of Directors instruct the [its] Liaison Committee to effect an agreement with its ACPRA counterpart that henceforth all deliberations and conclusions of the Liaison Committees have the approval of their respective Boards of Directors before their promulgation. It was agreed that this would be a prudent procedure."[180]

The subject of redistricting, hopefully to enable a larger number of AAC and ACPRA districts to hold joint annual conferences, was one which caused some unpleasantness at the meeting.[181] In April, 1964, Hewlett and Johnson, at that time AAC's executive director, had reported to the Joint Liaison Committee regarding the advantages of redistricting and presented maps to indicate feasible boundaries. Hewlett had also informed the committee that ACPRA's Executive Committee would be recommending the proposed boundary changes to the Board of Trustees at the Association's 1964 conference.[182] As reported earlier, the action recommended was taken and the number of ACPRA districts was reduced from eleven to nine. Now it was charged by one member of AAC's committee that ACPRA had taken unilateral action on the realignment of districts and therefore presented the alumni group with a *fait accompli*.[183]

Stadtman, according to Cooke's report on the February 24 meeting, said that the AAC Board could not change district boundaries without the full consent of the districts involved. He said, however, that he would recommend to the AAC Board in June that it undertake a study which might lead to realignment of AAC boundaries. "But," he warned, "it would be unfair to give encouragement to ACPRA to expect accomplishment of AAC realignment in the near future." Moreover, should district boundary changes be decided upon by AAC, a constitutional amendment would be necessary to make them effective. ACPRA's representatives indicated their Association "would consider further realignment if it developed that the changes made last year were not satisfactory."

When the discussion turned to the proposed joint placement service, Stadtman reported that AAC's Board had voted the preceding summer not to pursue the subject for the time being. "AAC," Cooke's report as secretary *pro tem* read, "is not yet convinced that this is a proper area of cooperation, while ACPRA is extremely interested in a joint operation that would merely pay for itself." It was agreed, however, that the two central offices would restudy the various aspects of the placement service as a joint operation and report back to the Liaison Committee before further action was taken by their respective Boards of Trustees.

The Lending Library on which the Liaison Committees had gained agreement at earlier meetings was reported to be running smoothly. Turning to new business, the committee decided that in 1965-66 the liaison groups might well study the basic philosophies and purposes of the two organizations and that the Liaison Committees "might realize more constructive progress if they looked beyond the more obvious areas of cooperation and duplication in present efforts and undertook new joint effort on projects of deeper significance for the advancement of higher education." The conferees also decided that it would be advisable for the two central offices to confer on dates and subject matter for workshops to avoid possible conflicts and to offer members of both organizations opportunity to attend such conferences. The possibility of cooperation in annual competitions and with address lists was also broached. The Liaison Committees decided that, with unfinished business in several areas and with problems and questions likely to arise concerning the 1968 joint conference, they should meet again in the fall. An exchange of letters between Denison and Miss Field immediately following the joint liaison group's meeting in Washington consummated the agreement of the AAC and ACPRA to meet together in 1968 and 1969 along the lines the two organizations had been considering for two years.

When ACPRA held its 1965 conference in Cincinnati, the delegates passed a resolution expressing satisfaction with the alternate-year plan adopted and voicing hope that it would be continued for the national conferences of 1970 and 1971.[184]

Although there had been for a decade or more frequent mention of duplication and overlapping of ACPRA and AAC membership and activities, no action to determine just how much there really was had ever been taken. Then in March and April, 1965, Trustee Fred Hess conducted a thoroughgoing survey, results of which were reported in a twenty-nine-page document addressed to ACPRA's Board of Trustees.

Using the AAC directory as of December, 1964, and the ACPRA directory as of September, 1964, Hess determined the duplicated member institutions and the duplicated member representatives among the two- and four-year degree-granting colleges and universities located in the fifty states and the District of Columbia.

Hess found that 1,122 institutions in the United States held membership in AAC or ACPRA. Of these 903 were members of ACPRA, 941 of AAC and 722 of both organizations. Of the 2,555 individuals at that time holding membership in ACPRA, 751 were also members of AAC. Most of the 751 were also concerned primarily with three fields: 325 with development, 247 with public relations, and 113 with alumni affairs.[185]

Cooperative activities with AAC along lines previously approved were continued following the meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee in Washington. The Lending Library, which had received some 1,200 requests for information during the first year of its operation as a joint project of the two associations, grew both in content and in use.[186] To the ten volumes of special materials ACPRA had published since 1958, four others, *Descriptions of Selected Case Studies, Education '64—Unity from Diversity, Guidelines to Gift Records* (a manual on efficient gift recording systems), and a revised edition of *Selected Bibliography on College Public Relations and Development*, first published in 1961, were added. *Descriptions of Selected Case Studies*, composed of twenty-eight of the studies which won certificates of exceptional achievement or special merit in the 1964 Honors Competition, and *Education '64—Unity from Diversity*, composed of the papers presented by speakers and panelists at the Los Angeles conference, were the most popular of the editions and several of the studies included in the former were published in Spanish later in the year for the benefit of fifteen Latin American universities.[187]

When, for the time being, it became impossible for ACPRA and AAC to work together on placement services, ACPRA continued with its own service along the lines started the preceding year. Leslie in his annual report indicated that the new publication, *Placement Newsletter*, was carrying an average of sixty listings a month and that an average of twenty-five institutions and thirty to thirty-five individuals were responding to its advertisements each month.[188]

ACPRA's philosophy that the Association should be a service organization ready to assist member institutions and sister organizations to advance their educational aims was emphasized in 1964-65. Cooperative efforts were continued with the American Association of Junior Collges and the Public Relations Society of America as well as organizations like the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Association of American Colleges, Independent College Funds of America, American Council on Education, and others with whom it had worked for a number of years.

The cooperative effort with the AAJC was a foundation relations workshop held in New York in May, 1965. The workshop, limited to 150 registrants, was held to enable teams of junior college representatives, including the president, a trustee, and the dean or development officer, to gain firsthand information on foundation policies and procedures, and to enable foundation representatives in attendance to become better acquainted with junior college programs and personnel.[189]

Speaking at ACPRA's 1964 convention, Ovid R. Davis, president-elect of PRSA, had proposed greater cooperation among business, public relations, and the academic community in "solving our problems of mutual interest and concern." As a result Greta Murphy of Milwaukee School of Engineering was named by ACPRA's trustees to serve as liaison officer with PRSA. Later in the year four members of ACPRA, including President Denison, were chosen to serve on the panel of judges for PRSA's twenty-first annual Silver Anvil Awards Competition. When the awards were presented in May, three institutional members of ACPRA—Auburn University, California Institute of Arts, and Bowling Green State University—were among the twenty recipients.[190]

A move to initiate cooperation with foreign universities in building development and public relations programs was made by ACPRA's Executive Committee at its meeting in October, 1964. In consequence, James S. Triolo of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, who proposed the action, was later named as chairman of an International Programs Study Committee.[191] At this time ACPRA had only twelve foreign universities with a total of twenty-one member representatives on its roster.[192] The action suggested by Triolo was at least partially responsible for the fact that the Association had sixty-one member representatives from forty-eight universities in sixteen foreign countries and Puerto Rico a decade later.[193]

Among the programs inaugurated by ACPRA in 1964-65 was that of holding five national institutes annually on the same theme. These institutes were part of the three-year program approved by the trustees at Los Angeles. It was planned that ten more would be held over the next two years, those of each year to be devoted to a major phase of institutional development, communications, and management.

The institute program had been planned to achieve three goals: (1) to explore a special interest area in greater depth than was possible at district meetings or national conferences; (2) to make the same quality program available in several geographical areas of the country; (3) to add to the literature in the field with an annual publication of the edited proceedings of all five institutes. "Applications of Communications Research in Public Relations and Development Programs" was the theme for the 1964-65 institutes. With A. Westley Rowland, now assistant to the president at the State University of New York at Buffalo, as program coordinator and David Berlo, chairman of the Department of Communications at the College of Communications Arts of Michigan State University as resource coordinator, the institutes were held in Boston, Chapel Hill, East Lansing, San Francisco, and Denver between October and April. Although these institutes held in 1964-65, with more than 250 individuals attending, were regarded as successful, some structural weaknesses were uncovered and taken into account when the 1965-66 institutes were planned.

In addition to the workshops previously mentioned, ACPRA in 1964-65 co-sponsored two summer programs. The Workshop for College and University Relations Officers, covering all aspects of university relations, was held in Buffalo in July and the annual Summer Workshop for Fund Raising and Public Relations was held in Denver in August. The latter was designed for newcomers to the development field.[194]

By this time the Association Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy (COTP) was becoming quite important. Headed by Roland C. Matthies of Wittenberg University, it had been organized in 1962 as a "watchdog" group. But now its potential loomed sufficiently large to lead ACPRA's Executive Committee to authorize it to study its present status, then prepare a report with recommendations relative to its future role. The report presented in April indicated that the COTP should continue to be concerned "specifically with federal tax measures, regulations, procedures, and proposals related to voluntary giving to higher education" but that a broader program was needed "to help stop erosion of traditional tax encouragement to philanthropy."

Committee plans for the future, endorsed by the Executive Committee, called for continued work with Congress to encourage philanthropy by means of tax incentives; meetings with IRS representatives to improve communications; research on the relationship of tax policies to motivation toward philanthropy; workshops and district-related meetings meant to improve the competence of ACPRA members in the area of government aid to education through tax incentives; and publication of a primer of basic tax principles. It also planned to stress the importance of ethical standards, in part by drafting a basic code of ethics.[195]

Of the six regular publications ACPRA was now providing for its members—*College and University Journal, Education Abstracts, Newsletter, Placement Letter, Grapevine, and Membership Directory-Annual Reports*—the *Journal* continued to furnish the most valuable material and receive the widest recognition. Names of nationally, and sometimes internationally, known individuals appeared in every issue of Volume IV, including, for instance, those of Mark Van Doren, professor emeritus of English at Columbia University; S. I. Hayakawa, professor of English at San Francisco State College and famed semanticist; Clifford Lord, president of Hofstra College, and Asa S. Knowles, president of Northeastern University. It also brought, in its issue for the spring of 1965, information on development and public relations around the world with articles related to activities in England, Haiti, Southeast Asia, and Colombia.

Because conferences, committee meetings, and interviews were playing an increasingly important role in the lives of ACPRA members, they found the article by Hayakawa on "How to Attend a Conference" of special benefit.[196] There are two aspects of communication—output and input—Hayakawa emphasized, and the latter, especially the problem of how to listen well, is often neglected.

"It does not avail the speakers to have spoken well," Hayakawa said, "if we as listeners failed to understand, or if we come away believing them to have said things they didn't say at all. If a conference is to result in the exchange of ideas, we need to pay particular heed to our listening habits. . . . But few people, other than psychiatrists and women, have had much training in listening. The training of most oververbalized professional intellectuals (which would include most persons who attend conferences) is in the opposite direction. Living in a competitive culture, most of us are most of the time chiefly concerned with getting our own views across, and we tend to find other people's speeches a tedious interruption of the flow of our own ideas. Hence, it is necessary to emphasize that listening does not mean simply maintaining a polite silence while you are rehearsing in your mind the speech you are going to make the next time you can grab a conversational opening. Nor does listening mean waiting alertly for the flaws in the other fellow's arguments so that later you can mow him down. Listening means trying to see the problem the way the speaker sees it—which means not sympathy, which is *feeling for* him, but empathy, which is *experiencing with* him. Listening requires entering actively and imaginatively into the other fellow's situation and trying to understand a frame of reference different from your own.

"But a good listener does not merely remain silent. He asks questions. However, these questions must avoid implications (whether in tone of voice or in wording) of skepticism or challenge or hostility. They must be clearly motivated by curiosity about the speaker's views . . . .

"Something else that needs to be watched is the habit of overgeneralizing from the speaker's remarks. If a speaker is critical of, let us say, the way in which design is taught at a particular school, some persons in the audience seem automatically to assume that the speaker is saying that design shouldn't be taught at all . . . .

"All too often, the fact that misunderstanding exists is not apparent until deeper misunderstandings have already occurred because of the original one. We have all had the experience of being at meetings or at social gatherings at which Mr. X says something; Mr. Y believes Mr. X to have said something quite different and argues against what be believes Mr. X to have said. Then Mr. X, not understanding Mr. Y's objections (which may be legitimate objections to what Mr. X didn't say), defends his original statement with further statements. These further statements, interpreted by Mr. Y in the light of mistaken assumptions, lead to further mistaken assumptions, which in turn induce in Mr. X mistaken assumptions about Mr. Y. In a matter of minutes, the discussion is a dozen miles away from the original topic. Thereafter it can take from twenty minutes to two hours to untangle the mess and restore the discussion to a consideration of Mr. X's original point. . . .

"All this is not to say that I expect or wish conferences to avoid argument. But let us argue about what has been said, and not about what has not been said. And let us discuss not for victory but for clarification. If we do so, we shall find, I believe, that ultimately, agreement and disagreement, approval and disapproval, are not very important after all. The important thing is to come away from a conference with a fund of information—information about what other people are doing and thinking and why. It is only as we fully understand opinions and attitudes different from our own and the reasons for them that we better understand our own place in the scheme of things. Which is but another way of saying that while the result of communications successfully imparted is self-satisfaction, the result of communications successfully received is self-insight. Let us attend conferences and take part in them not only for the sake of increased self-satisfaction, but also for the sake of increased self-insight."

Material of quality was now being received by the *Journal* in such abundance that the quarterly could no longer find space for all of it. Consequently, the *Newsletter* also began carrying some articles, most of them a page or less in length. The first of these, titled "Tarkio College—a Second Phoenix," appeared in the October, 1964, issue and half a dozen others were published in later issues.

Even while plans for the 1965 annual conference scheduled for July 5-8 in Cincinnati were moving forward, those for the 1966 and 1967 conferences were getting underway. After thirty years the Association would return to Boston in 1966 as decided by the Executive Committee in June, 1963, and the dates would be July 5-8. John S. Bailey of Northeastern University had been named months back to serve as conference coordinator and now Edgar B. Cale of the University of Pittsburgh was appointed program chairman.[197] Scheduled to observe its fiftieth anniversary in 1967, ACPRA wanted to make sure that the best possible site would be chosen for the observance. The trustees named a Site Selection Committee headed by Fred Hess of Grinnell College, a long-time leader in the Association. His committee considered twelve cities, then recommended Dallas. The Executive Committee and trustees approved the recommendation and set the dates at July 23-26.[198]

A two-day School for Public Relations and Development Officers, designed as a review of the fundamentals and "how-to" techniques for the various subject areas—information services, publications, alumni affairs, and fund raising—was inaugurated by ACPRA to precede the 1965 convention. The school, directed by Robert Taylor of the University of Wisconsin, drew 180 registrants on July 4-5, among them a registrant who said he had been in the field "for only forty-five minutes." Also preceding the national conference was the second annual District Officers Workshop, planned by

Hess on the theme, "Planning and Producing a District Conference."[199]

With Michael Radock, vice president for university relations at the University of Michigan, and John A. Moser, director of development at Xavier University, as program chairman and conference coordinator, respectively, the 1965 national conference was held July 5-8. The theme was "Campus America, 1965-1975—Its Character, Its Concerns, Its Consequences." Radock introduced a major program innovation by structuring two sessions on the theme, "A New Look At . . . ." All members of the Association were invited to submit 1,000- to 2,000-word papers touching on any topic within five categories—administration, the information concept, the development operation, the publications program, and alumni affairs. Fifty-eight papers were submitted and of these thirty-one were selected for presentation by their authors.[200]

Concurrent discussion sessions for seven kinds of institutions—private independents, Protestant colleges, Catholic colleges, state universities, state colleges, medical schools, and junior colleges—occupied delegates during much of two half days, the discussions in every case being on the topics used by speakers at general sessions earlier in the day. General session subjects on which the institutional session discussions were based included "The Institution as a Citizen," "Equal Opportunity—and Rights," "Congress—IRS—Colleges," and "The History and Future of Philanthropy in the Financing of Higher Education." The speakers' list included such individuals as Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh; Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University and president of the Indiana University Foundation.[201]

A frequent speaker at district and national conferences of ACPRA, Wells told the conferees there were "three major factors in our future situation over which you may have some influence if not absolute control." These he listed as "(1) that which the people know and understand *now* about higher education and its significance in this society; (2) those actions we take in this critical period in our somewhat frantic search for solutions to our institutional problems and in our efforts to meet the demands for more higher education; and (3) that which we do in the future to improve upon the processes and the messages for informing and communicating with our society toward the goal of deserving as well as securing support and understanding for higher educating." Wells urged his listeners to remember always that "selling education is not selling soap."

"In your obligation to counsel in public relations, retain your objectivity, and inform yourselves in depth," he said. "Never let your trustees become employers, but rather continually educate them to the sacred trust they bear on behalf of society . . . . Build whatever you build for a long time, and make no small plans for your institution . . . . See that your institution is a good citizen in its own community and in its educational community.. . . . Remember that pride and prestige are the best convincers for supporting an institution, not a pleading of poverty."[202]

The Honors Competition, held as a feature of the national conference for a decade, became even more attractive when the Sears, Roebuck Foundation announced that it would make possible incentive grants of $250, compared to $100 the preceding year, for entries receiving certificates of exceptional achievement. The announcement resulted in ninety-five case studies in program management, financial support, and information programs and more than 600 entries in the publications category. Two sessions of the national conference were given over to workshops built around the entries, one focusing on publications, the other on case studies.[203] Ten of the entries, eight of them in case studies and two in publications, were later awarded certificates of exceptional achievement and $250 prizes. Sixty others received certificates of special merit.

The Association's annual award for distinguished service to education went to *Saturday Review* at the Cincinnati convention. No award for outstanding achievement was conferred. The *Saturday Review* citation read in part: "No periodical has taken its responsibility to higher education more seriously than the *Saturday Review*. This concern has not been sporadic or sensational, but has been marked by thoroughness, permanence, reason, and creativity. The writing has been of uniformly high order and the subject matter has cut across the spectrum of education illuminating those areas of current or future interest. Many articles sparked controversy, few have failed to awake interest. A new dimension of dignified attention to academic affairs has been the gratifying result."[204]

Early in his administration Denison had appointed Robert Reilly of Creighton University to head a committee to analyze the Association's current policy on awards and make recommendations. The committee's report, adopted by the Board of Trustees at a meeting in April, set up guidelines for making one award for distinguished service to higher education and one award for outstanding achievement each year, the former to go to a nonmember individual or organization and the latter to a member of the Association in recognition of contributions to the interpretation and understanding of higher education. Only one award of each kind was to be made in a given year. ACPRA's districts were likewise authorized to confer annually one award of each kind but in their case the awards were to be known as cititations and be so prepared as not to conflict or be confused with national awards.[205] The Reilly committee also suggested that citations of service be established to honor individuals who had completed twenty-five years of service as member representatives of the Association.

At their April meeting the trustees also authorized a full study of educational advancement programs, both in public relations and development. Charles Newton, an Association trustee from California Institute of Technology, who had suggested the study at an Executive Committee meeting in October, was made director of the project. James M. Shea, director of university relations at the University of Oregon, was appointed to work on the study in the national office as staff man while on sabbatical leave during the 1965-66 winter term. A committee under Newton was also charged with developing a presentation seeking foundation aid in financing the project expected to cost approximately $50,000.

Four bylaw changes were approved by the membership at the Cincinnati meeting. The more important ones called for the fiscal year to start September 1 rather than August 1, and for all trustees and officers, national and district, to assume office at the time of the Association's national conference or at the beginning of the next fiscal year in case no conference was held. The other changes called for the president-elect and past president to serve as members of the Board of Trustees *ex officio* and upon assumption of their offices to become ineligible to serve as trustee representatives of districts or as trustees-at-large. The other change outlined the procedure to be followed by the Executive Committee when vacancies on the Board of Trustees occurred.[206]

Because of the large increase in the dues structure voted a year earlier, ACPRA's Board of Trustees had anticipated a ten percent drop in membership. Instead, membership increased approximately five percent to a total of 2,752 individuals representing 1,021 institutions and organizations.[207] The increased income from dues enabled the Association to finish a year in the black for the first time since 1961. Operating income for the year ending July 31, 1965, was $197,882 while expenditures were $133,238 leaving a balance of $64,644. Income for the thirteen-month period between August 1, 1964, and September 1, 1965, when fiscal 1965-66 was scheduled to start under the revised bylaws, was $243,-264 and expenditures were $178,756. Thus the Association had a good reserve for fiscal 1965-66 when the new simultaneous billing system was scheduled to become a policy. The financial report made by Leslie also showed that the Frankenberg Endowment Fund had increased during the thirteen-month period from $1,651 to $3,222 through interest and transfers from the general fund.[208]

Before the business meeting closed at Cincinnati, Denison turned over the gavel to Patrick Nicholson, who introduced the officers and Executive Committee members elected by the Board of Trustees two days earlier. The president-elect was A. Westley Rowland, assistant to the president at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Dyar Massey of Emory University was secretary for the third year. Members elected for the Executive Committee, in addition to Rowland, Nicholson, Massey, and Denison as past president, were Robert T. Reilly of Creighton University, David S. Thompson of Princeton University, and James S. Triolo of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.[209]

During the year preceding the Cincinnati conference, small groups of dissident stockholders had begun to question the legality of corporate contributions made to educational institutions, hospitals, the United Fund, and other charitable organizations. Concerned by this trend, the delegates in a special business meeting on the last day of the conference passed unanimously a resolution "to express the Association's strong encouragement of those corporations which have affirmed the propriety of corporate contributions to worthy causes, and to urge that corporations over the nation join in such affirmation, specifically by continuing present and accepted policies and by resisting the attempts of small and dissident groups to act against both the best interests of business leadership and of our nation overall."[210]

Denison closed his year in the presidency with an address which reemphasized his own philosophy of operations and issued a warning to his colleagues.

"In public relations," he said, "the practitioner tries hard *not* to let his guiding hand be seen. In a skilled performance, he is inconspicuous. In a superlative performance, he is invisible. It is enough for him to know that all went as he had planned. . . .

"We know," he declared, "that for every professor who does not teach there are a dozen skilled, devoted teachers. We know that for every autocratic dean of students there are a score who are patient, understanding, considerate. We know that the very proliferation of courses and curriculum gives the lie to the charge that every student is being forced into a rigid mold. We know that every dollar invested in higher education, whether it comes from public, private, or philanthropic sources, is a dollar well invested. We know it—but a great many people don't. Why don't they? Could it be that we are doing less well than we should be doing? Could it be that we have talked and written too much about our new buildings, too little about the fine and wonderful things happening in them? Could it be that we stress too much the economic advantages of higher education, too little the intangible personal benefit derived from college experience?

". . . . Now public attention is beginning to focus slowly upon new areas—human relations, the social compact, the plight of the underprivileged, the blight of poverty, civil rights. These in contrast are fraught with controversy. Our colleges and universities will be, must be, deeply involved. So, too, shall we."[211]

10

Celebration—and Acceleration

Leadership From Texas

Pat Nicholson's rise "from private to president" in ACPRA was nothing short of spectacular. Joining the Association when he became vice president for development at the University of Houston in 1957, Nicholson was named to the organization's Board of Directors as one of eleven representatives of the Development Section two years later and served until 1961. On the morning of July 4, 1964, ACPRA's Board of Trustees elected him to a three-year term as trustee-at-large.[1] Three hours later it unanimously named him president-elect, an action which would elevate him to the presidency in 1965.[2]

Although Nicholson had held no national elective office in ACPRA before being named president-elect, he had gained high regard among the leadership by outstanding work, especially on two appointive jobs. The first of these was the detailed study he had made in 1962 concerning the relationships among the various bodies of the organization—trustees, councils, districts, and national office. As already recorded, this study had led to substantial changes in the Association's bylaws. And as a member of the Association's Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy since its creation in 1962, Nicholson had performed yeoman service in that group's efforts to work with government on tax matters of vital importance to colleges and universities while at the same time seeking to keep institutions and their development officers fully apprised of tax legislation, existing and proposed, and the related obligations, responsibilities, opportunities, and dangers. Since its creation COTP had sought, at district meetings and through workshops held in conjunction with such meetings, to provide information and guidance for member institutions and representatives. And no one had given more time to these efforts than Nicholson.

Although he had been a member of ACPRA less than seven years when tapped for the presidency, Nicholson was no neophyte in public relations. After three years of active duty in signal intelligence with the U. S. Army during and following World War II, he worked for nine years as a consultant with public relations firms specializing in publications and communication. In addition, as a major in the Army Reserve, he had been since 1956 a mobilization designee assigned to the Office of Chief of Information, The Pentagon.[3]

When Nicholson was considered for a critical assignment, he was described in a report with such adjectives as "blue-eyed, curly-haired, noncontentious, persuasive, articulate, dependable, over-emotional in the Irish tradition, perennial enthusiast, and typical Texas chauvinist." One other phrase should have been included: "great sense of humor."

And Nicholson found this quality of real value as he ranged over the country and into Canada giving addresses at workshops and district meetings during his year in the presidency. On one occasion, possibly because the district director took it for granted that Nicholson was known by all, two days passed before anyone got around to introducing him. At another meeting, held on a day when President Johnson's broad-gauge social improvement program was receiving wide-spread publicity, Nicholson noted that "the Great Society had been launched with less than full brilliance for those in attendance at this conference." As he spoke, the hotel's water supply had been turned off for some sixteen hours while a huge work force tore up most of an adjoining alley looking for a leaking pipe. Meanwhile, the heat had gone off and the temperature outside had plummeted to about fifteen degrees.

During his presidency Nicholson continued to take an active part in the work of COTP but objected when Sydney Prerau, editor of *Taxwise Giving* and a consultant to the committee, scheduled a session on Saint Patrick's Day. This, Nicholson complained, would make it necessary for him to miss a colorful parade and a series of parties in Houston. However, he accepted with good grace Prerau's retort: This was merely retribution for an earlier session which Nicholson in innocence had set for Yom Kippur.[4]

Solid achievement in half a dozen major areas marked the Nicholson administration. These included increased activity and accomplishment of key committees such as Taxation and Philanthropy, International Relations, and Professional Advancement; continued liaison with AAC; expansion of workshops and institute activity; achievement of greater financial stability; and enlargement of the publications program.

With Roland Matthies of Wittenberg University continuing as chairman, the COTP expanded its activities by providing programs for five two-day workshops held in connection with district conferences. In addition, it brought together representatives of health, religious, welfare, and other educational organizations in four meetings to consider mutual problems related to financial support. Programs for the five-session workshops, attended by more than 300 members, were identical. The subjects covered in each case were "Laying Out the Ground Rules," "Charitable Gift Annuities," "Life Income Plans," "Bequests—Life Insurance," and "Your Resources at Home and Afield."[5] In cooperation with ACE, the committee also served as a watchdog as it sought to shore up erosions in deductibility rulings proposed in Congress and by the IRS.[6] So important and comprehensive had the committee's activities become that the Board of Trustees in July, 1966, began to consider the desirability of advancing it to commission status. Meeting on the same day, the Executive Committee took under consideration a request Willard Hunter, coordinator of development at Claremont Graduate School and University Center, was making for a $10,000 grant from ACPRA to help finance a study he was planning to conduct on taxation as it affected philanthropy. Hunter, a member of COTP, now enlarged to ten men, had already secured foundation commitments of approximately $14,500 for his project.[7]

The International Relationships Committee, which had been created as an ad hoc group in the fall of 1964, now became a standing committee concentrating on the implementation of a broad program drawn under its orginator and chairman, James S. Triolo, vice president of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest. Allotted a budget of $500 (of which only $111 was spent),[8] the committee created a consulting service for foreign institutions desiring to import the "know-how" and "how-to" of ACPRA leaders concerning public relations and development. By February the committee was also able to report that thirteen of the twenty-eight winning case study entries in the 1965 Honors Competition had been translated into Spanish for use in Latin America. In addition, it reported that it had started to determine the interest of English universities in development work.[9] Triolo's committee also pointed up the difficulties Canadian and Mexican institutions faced in participating in ACPRA activities and recommended that the Association set its membership fee at $100 for institutions outside the fifty states. Approved in March, 1966, this recommendation helped the Association to increase its membership among international institutions from eighteen in 1966 to twenty-three by the time the fiftieth anniversary was observed in the summer of 1967.[10] Thereafter, memberships from outside the fifty states increased steadily until they included forty-eight institutions in sixteen countries and Puerto Rico in 1974.[11]

ACPRA in 1965-66 began to implement more completely the recommendations made by its Committee on Professional Advancement headed by past President Edward P. VonderHaar. Principal among these were efforts to assist high school counselors understand the advancement areas, encouragement of internships, attention to the subject of professional advancement at district and national conferences, efforts to inform college placement officers of opportunities in the field, and provision of complimentary subscriptions to ACPRA periodicals to public relations teachers and bulk subscription rates to students.[12]

The major study of public relations and development programs initiated during the Denison administration was carried forward with the circulation of questionnaires to 1,058 institutions and planning for a considerable number of in-depth interviews on campuses around the country. The project's principal goal was the development of criteria for more effective and efficient utilization of personnel and resources. Publication of the study's conclusions, scheduled for sometime in 1967, promised to have an influence on public relations and development programs no less than that of the Greenbrier Conference of 1958.

The study, planned by Charles Newton, assistant to the president and director of development at California Institute of Technology, began with the construction of a four-part questionnaire, the first section of which was to be completed by the college or university president. The other three sections, dealing with public relations, fund raising, and alumni activities, were to be filled out by a person designated by the president.

Administration of the study project was being conducted in the national office by James M. Shea, on a sabbatical from the University of Oregon where he was director of university relations. By May, 1966, Shea was able to report that all basic work for the study had been completed and the questionnaires received had been shipped to Cal Tech where the information would be fed into computers before the end of the summer. Following an in-depth analysis, the report of findings would be published and issued to all institutions participating in the project and made available to others on request.[13]

Although the correspondence between the officers of ACPRA and AAC, as well as the meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee, had generated some heat the preceding year, relations between the two organizations continued smoothly during 1965-66. ACPRA's Executive Committee at a meeting in November agreed that the alternate-year annual conference plan scheduled on a trial basis for 1968 and 1969 ought to be continued beyond the latter year and invited AAC cooperation toward that end.[14]

AAC's Board of Directors at a meeting in January, 1966, gave much of its time to a discussion of AAC-ACPRA relations, then issued the following policy statement to its membership:

"The officers of ACPRA have for some years been urging ever-closer cooperation between their organization and ours. We have collaborated with them in various ways, including participation in a Joint Liaison Committee, a common lending library, and scheduling of numerous joint district conferences. We have been prepared to consider any other forms of cooperation which promised to serve the best interests of our members.

"It appears to us that throughout all these activities the possibility of merging the two organizations has always loomed in the background. Although ACPRA officers have said that they do not seek merger in the near future, we sense from their public statements that they regard this as a desirable end.

"A year ago, the AAC board distributed a statement to all members in which we indicated that, while we recognized areas of common interest between the two organizations, we believed that, by both history and purpose, AAC and ACPRA were separate organizations and should remain so. This is still our view, and we have come to feel that good relations between us will best be served by making this clear. We have instructed our representatives on the Joint Liaison Committee to continue to pursue this policy in discussions with their ACPRA counterparts.

"We have also instructed our Liaison Committee members to make no further commitments on joint national conferences until such time as the board has had an opportunity to evaluate our experience with those now scheduled for 1968 and 1969, Our present interest is to hold our own separate conference in 1970 during the period of evaluation, but to consider sites for subsequent years which would permit joint conferences if desired by AAC boards at that time.

"With respect to joint district conferences, we reaffiarm the right and privilege of each of our districts to make their own choice from year to year. The question of changing AAC district boundaries is left to district initiative. Present boundaries are established by our constitution. They can therefore be changed only by constitutional amendment, not by the board.

"The officers of ACPRA state that they are under some pressure on the campuses to eliminate duplication of membership and participation in our two organizations. We have examined this question and do not find that it is a problem for most of our membership. Only a small portion of AAC members belong also to ACPRA, and indeed the majority of our members have no reason to belong to ACPRA, since its historic purpose does not include programming for their fields of work . . . .

"We reaffirm the three basic principles set forth at the end of our statement of February, 1965:

> (1) The primary basis for all our decisions is our belief that the commitment and involvement of alumni in education is the essential rationale which must underlie all our actions: that we should concentrate our energies and resources on activities informed with this sense of purpose.
>
> (2) That we consider that ACPRA has, over its long existence, had a different, but valid sense of purpose, and that cooperation between the two organizations, in whatever degree, should be judged not as a necessary end in itself but in the light of whether it serves and sustains the purposes of each organization. Our Liaison Committee will continue discussions with its ACPRA counterpart within this framework.
>
> (3) We undertake to work as diligently as possible to develop and promote programs which help our members, educational institutions, and alumni generally to advance an effective partnership between alumni and education.

"And, finally, we wish to make clear that we take an affirmative attitude toward cooperation with ACPRA as with other organizations; but cooperation presupposes two strong, independent parties, each with its own sure sense of purpose. We shall strive to be strong, independent, and effective in serving our member institutions."[15]

At a March meeting in St. Louis, ACPRA's Board of Trustees indicated agreement with the November decision of the Association's Executive Comittee that efforts should be made to extend joint national conferences beyond 1969. It also agreed that efforts should be made to promote joint district meetings as well as cooperation with AAC to assure the best possible national conferences in 1968 and 1969. It then approved unanimously the following statement for presentation to the Joint Liaison Committee at a meeting scheduled for March:

"The Board of Trustees of ACPRA, meeting in St. Louis on March 8-9, 1966, considered again the important matter of AAC-ACPRA relationships, especially in terms of two recent developments: (1) the January 24, 1966, statement of the AAC Directors, which has become widely available to our membership because of the high percentage of institutions and institutional representatives belonging to both organizations; and (2) ACPRA's decision to move strongly toward newly-expanding programs in the overall field of institutional advancement, and to propose a new name for the organization more clearly reflecting its widening responsibilities in development, public relations, communications, and management.

"The January 24 AAC statement emphasizes again that AAC will wish to confine itself to 'an essential rationale' of 'the commitment and involvement of alumni education'. AAC seems therefore committed to a policy of pursuing a valuable but highly specialized role. Such a role; we now see, stands in contrast to the much wider objectives of ACPRA; and especially to the expanding horizons of our organization.

'The trustees of ACPRA concluded that as the one organization reaffirms its narrowly restricted yet vital mission, and the other a more inclusive spectrum of interest, the rationale has at last been established for the elimination of the unnecessary duplication of functions and services. They invite their colleagues in AAC to work with them to that purpose.

"Although the two organizations have taken clearly divergent paths, it was reiterated by the governing body of ACPRA that this organization will continue to cooperate with our friends and colleagues in AAC, on a basis emphasizing joint district and national conferences, the combined lending library, and other appropriate cooperative activities."[16]

At the same meeting the trustees agreed that ACPRA, "within the framework of total institutional development and advancement, would program at its conferences for 'alumni relations from the institutional viewpoint'."

After reading the ACPRA statement at the March meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee meeting, Nicholson, who was serving as chairman of the group, reiterated "the strong desire of his Association to avoid unnecessary duplication and overlap of programs and services." Asked to estimate the number of ACPRA's institutional members affiliated also with the AAC, Nicholson pointed out that Fred Hess's 1965 survey had indicated that 722 institutions were in this category.

The AAC representatives were interested in Nicholson's reference to a name change for ACPRA and the president explained the rationale involved: "A name which included the phrase 'public relations' was no longer adequate to describe the varied interests and responsibilities of the membership, which now spanned overall management, fund raising, public relations, communications, and institutional alumni relations."

Nicholson's mention of institutional alumni relations as an ACPRA interest brought several questions from AAC's representatives who desired an interpretation of the phrase. Nicholson indicated that ACPRA would continue to program in the field of institutional alumni affairs at its various conferences, schools, and workshops, because approximately 200 individuals affiliated with ACPRA had the word "alumni" in their titles. Many more, he added, had broad responsibilities for the administration of institutional programs involving alumni as part of their overall assignment. He assured his questioners that ACPRA programming would not be concerned with specialized alumni activities such as reunions, club and class agent activities, alumni association organization, and alumni funds. Rather, he emphasized, the programming, to the extent believed necessary, would be designed "for the broad perspective of alumni as one of the institution's publics."

After further discussion which indicated that AAC's representatives were still not clear on the exact definition of "institutional alumni programming," the Joint Liaison Committee turned its attention to other matters on which the two organizations were cooperating. Nicholson announced that the New York Hilton Hotel had been selected as the site of the combined AAC-ACPRA national conference which ACPRA would be sponsoring in 1969. The dates, he indicated, would be July 20-24.

Progress in the effort to encourage joint tandem sessions at the district level was noted when Nicholson announced that eleven of the eighteen AAC and ACPRA districts had met in such sessions during the current year. A discussion of possibilities for additional joint conferences and for realignment of AAC districts to conform with those of ACPRA resulted in a consensus that steps for such action should be determined essentially by the districts themselves.[17]

George Cooke, executive director of AAC, reported that the Ford Motor Company Fund had recently made a grant of $5,000 to assist the AAC-ACPRA Lending Library in providing more efficient service to the memberships of both organizations. The grant would, first of all, permit classification of library materials and thus reduce greatly the time needed for "information retrieval," frequently achieved in the past only after extensive research by a staff member in the AAC office. The grant would also finance the purchase of new equipment designed to expedite shipment of requested materials and to prevent their deterioration through frequent use.[18] In the six-month period preceding the meeting of the Joint Liaison Committee, 556 folders and other material had been circulated in response to requests from ACPRA members.[19]

The committee again discussed the placement services of the two associations, then instructed the staff officers to explore further the desirability of affiliation with a national placement service for all higher education. Before adjourning, the Joint Liaison Committee also recommended that the AAC and ACPRA office staffs plan "as many regular meetings among themselves as possible to exchange information on activities and plans." Such action, it was agreed, "was highly desirable to avoid duplication of effort and generally for improved communication and liaison."[20]

The April, 1966, issue of the *Newsletter* carried, in juxtaposition to the policy statement the AAC directors had drawn on January 24, a presentation from Nicholson to the ACPRA membership. In addition to giving the text of the statement ACPRA's Board of Trustees had prepared for the Joint Liaison Committee meeting in March, Nicholson provided some of the thinking which had gone into the presentation to the Joint Liaison Committee.

"There is a substantial body of opinion," said Nicholson, "that both organizations have expanded into programs, publications, and services which involve varying degrees of unnecessary duplication. This has been most evident to the increasing number of ACPRA member representatives who are charged with responsibility for planning and control in the overall field of institutional advancement. Accordingly, our Association has taken what we feel is a justified initiative in urging closer attention to the elimination of duplication and to increased cooperation. The record is clear on those matters.

"As our trustees studied the January 24 AAC statement, it seemed evident that the AAC will confine itself to 'involvement of alumni in education' and to advancing 'an effective partnership between alumni and education'. We examined this in the light of the objectives and purposes of ACPRA as stated in the Articles of Organization: '. . . to aid and assist its members in their efforts to improve their relations with the varied constituencies which they serve and to which they are responsible as institutions of higher learning. In doing so, the Association shall be concerned with all facets of its members' relations both within their respective internal organizations and within the larger communities which they serve'.

"From this background, the ACPRA trustees saw that the AAC statement of January 24, although disappointing upon first examination, might well lead the way to diminished duplication as our Association continues a broadened implementation of its formally-stated purposes and objectives."

After next presenting the text of the statement he had been authorized to read to the Joint Liaison Committee, Nicholson concluded with two paragraphs looking to the future of his Association.

"ACPRA expansion," he said, "will involve additional emphasis upon research (such as the ongoing major management study), professional advancement, committee activity (the growing program of the Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy, and new bodies concerned with publications and internal relations, for example) plus new services and publications. We do not foresee any marked growth in the field of institutional alumni relations, although this remains an important concern to be reflected as in the past in our expanding schools, workshops, and programs.

"The trustees are virtually unanimous in their opinion that the time is overdue for a name change more accurately reflecting the fact that our member representatives are engaged not merely in public relations, but in management, fund raising, and the combined field of public relations-communications. We are proceeding slowly, but steadily, in this matter, and plan to discuss it at the district meetings this coming year before presenting you with all pros and cons, plus a clear choice between the new and the old."[21]

The name change to which Nicholson alluded had been under discussion by the Executive Committee and Board of Trustees since the preceding fall. At its meeting in March the board had voted, 23 to 1, to accept the Executive Committee's recommendation that the name be changed to "Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities." During the business meeting at the 1966 annual conference in Boston, and again in the August issue of the *Newsletter*, the procedure to be followed was carefully explained. Two districts had already heard discussions of the rationale for the change—that a name including the phrase "public relations" was no longer adequate to describe the varied interests and responsibilities of the membership—and the other districts would be holding similar discussions before March, 1967. On that date ballots would be sent to all institutional members along with a statement presenting arguments both for and against the proposed change. If two-thirds of the voting membership favored the change, the Association would begin operating under the new name on September 1, 1967, at the climax of its fiftieth anniversary.[22]

Workshops and institutes by 1965 had become so important among ACPRA services that planning was started two years ahead. Attendance at the five institutes held in 1964-65 had totaled more than 250, and five more were planned for 1965-66. "Motivation for Support of Higher Education" was selected as the theme for the institutes scheduled for Atlanta, Houston, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis, with Richard Evans, professor of psychology at the University of Houston, as general director. The San Francisco institute had to be cancelled because of the late resignation of the faculty resource coordinator but the others drew more than 150 participants. Out of these came proposals for such motivational studies as "Why trustees serve colleges and universities," "Why people give," "To what motives can higher education ethically appeal?" "How to develop a total institutional image," and "What are the ingredients for improved faculty-administration relationship?"

Planning for the 1966-67 institutes started even before the Board of Tustees adjourned their meeting in Cincinnati in July, 1965. By the time the trustees met the following March, A. Westley Rowland, the president-elect, was able to announce that the 1966-67 institutes would include two on the management function and one each in the areas of publications, fund raising, and information services other than publications.[23]

In addition to the five workshops on deferred giving held under the auspices of the Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy, ACPRA continued to sponsor at Loretto Heights College in Denver a seven-day summer workshop which concentrated on the major concepts of successful college development and fund-raising programs.[24]

With the launching of *Techniques* in May, 1966, ACPRA raised to seven the number of publications it provided to members on a regular basis. The new publication, scheduled for appearance bimonthly, was presented in an attractive 8½ × 11-inch format, initially with twenty to twenty-four pages of "how-to" material related to the areas of public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, publications, and development. It was designed for inclusion in a permanent binder and promised to serve as a valuable reference source.

The Association's *28 Case Studies of Institutional Public Relations and Development Programs* had been greeted with appreciation the preceding year when published to provide members with synopses of award winning entries in the 1964 Honors Competition. Thus ACPRA continued to include the case studies as another of its regular publications. The Association's regular publications by 1966 included *College and University Journal*, a quarterly magazine; *Techniques*, a bimonthly; *Education Abstracts*, a monthly designed as a guide to books and articles on current issues in higher education; *Grapevine*, a monthly newsletter on state legislation affecting higher education; *Membership Directory and Annual Report*; the monthly *Newsletter*, and *Case Studies*, in 1966 a synopsis of the twenty-four winning entries in the Honors Competition for 1965. Among its other services the Association also continued to offer two special publications, W. Lynn Fluckiger's *Guide Lines for Gift Records Systems*, and D. Ray Hostetter's *The Challenge Grant and Higher Education*.[25]

Growth of the Association's publications program led to the appointment of a Publications Committee to outline broad-gauge policies and a full-time director of educational services. The trustees, at the suggestion of John Bennett, director of educational programs, and Executive Vice President John Leslie, named at their meeting in July, 1965, an ad hoc committee to consider the need for a Publications Committee. The ad hoc committee, headed by Howard Keyo of the University of Maine, recommended in the following March that a permanent Committee on Publications be appointed. Composed of eight or ten members of the Board of Trustees, this committee would work with the national office staff to: (1) review manuscripts to determine whether ACPRA should lend its support to publishing and distributing them; (2) determine areas in need of additional published material which should have ACPRA support; (3) suggest names of individuals who might be commissioned to write manuscripts; (4) advise on publishing arrangements including such matters as costs, copyrighting, and number of copies; (5) serve as a counseling body on all matters pertaining to publications, including internally and externally produced manuscripts.[26]

When Richard W. Smith resigned after four years as part-time editor of ACPRA publications, Brent Breedin, former university editor at Clemson, was named to the staff as director of editorial services starting April 15. His appointment, with specific responsibility for *College and University Journal* and *Education Abstracts*, marked the first time ACPRA had had three full-time professional staff people in the national office.[27]

ACPRA's new district alignment, voted in 1964, became effective in September, 1965, and attendance at most conferences (five were held in conjunction with AAC meetings) set new records. A number of factors helped to account for the increased attendance: the new alignment; the joint meetings with AAC districts; the deferred gifts workshops; the distribution to district officers of the papers on "How to Plan and Produce a District Conference" given during the District Officers Workshop at Cincinnati in 1965; distribution of a revised edition of *District Officers Manual*; and the fact that Nicholson was a featured speaker at most of the meetings.[28]

Nicholson was the only ACPRA president known to have written out all of his speeches in advance. Moreover, he always took the precaution of carrying two copies of his speech with him to the podium, a fact which at one meeting resulted in some embarassment but general merriment. As the president adjusted his two copies, a sharp-eyed individual in what was meant to have been *sotto voce* was plainly heard by all during a sudden silence, "Good grief, we're trapped; he's got about forty pages there."[29]

After a lapse of thirty years, ACPRA returned to Boston for its national conference on July 5-8, 1966. In 1936, when the organization was know as the American College Publicity Association and had only 258 members, eighty-one delegates were in attendance, a handful of them accompanied by wives or husbands. With a membership now including 1,035 institutions and organizations and more than 2,800 individuals, the Association found 870 registrants in attendance at the 1966 conference, nearly 200 of them accompanied by their spouses. Both the membership and conference attendance figures set new records.[30]

So too did the registration for the two-day School for Public Relations and Development Officers held immediately preceding the conference. The school, which drew 222 participants, concentrated on information services, publications, institutional alumni relations, and fund raising. It also provided several of the leading articles published in *Techniques* and *College and University Journal* during the following year.[31]

In planning for the annual conference, the Executive Committee had set a budget of

$13,000, and adopted "Partnerships: Emerging Pattern for Progress" as the theme.[32]

A blue-ribbon roster of speakers, including four college presidents, a former university president, a university dean, Massachusetts Attorney General (later Senator) Edward W. Brooke, and Al Capp, creator of the Li'l Abner cartoon strip, helped make the 1966 conference program one of the most attractive the Association had yet held. And neither the 100-degree temperatures with which they were greeted nor the airline strike they faced as the conference ended dulled the enthusiasm of the participants.[33]

Opening the conference, Edgar B. Cale of the University of Pittsburgh, program chairman, explained the rationale for the conference theme. "To do an adequate job in educational public relations today," he asserted, "one must be able to do more than tell a good story; he must have a story to tell and know *why* it is worthy of telling. And in development work, certainly the routine manipulation of lists and the mechanized contacting of prospects for annual giving are no more important than the understanding and skillful implementation of programs of community relations, fund development, and resources management. They are all a matter of teamwork."[34]

College and University Journal, in a special section of its edition for the fall of 1966, printed the addresses of the six present and former college officials—Howard F. Lowry, John W. Atherton, William W. Hagerty, and Philip G. Hoffman, presidents of the College of Wooster, Pitzer College, Drexel Institute, and University of Houston, respectively; Franklyn A. Johnson, director of Job Corps and formerly president of California State College and Jacksonville University, and Joseph H. Hartley, associate dean of faculties at Indiana University. All discussed facets of the conference theme. Lowry emphasized the important roles of public relations and development men as the partnership of colleges grew with their local communities, government, business and industry, foundations, sister colleges, and their own people on campus.

"The college," said Lowry, "exists in two very real worlds: the world of its own community, its specific location, the town, the state, the nation—perhaps we should even say the world. . . . But in another sense a college is not located anywhere at all, and this is its second and glorious dimension. For it has membership in a world or tradition of learning that transcends both place and time, a world equally real and even more demanding, a world that has its own ideals and integrity. . . .

"In short, colleges and universities live in two worlds and have a meaningful partnership with both of them. And partnership here means more than mere cooperation and agreeable relations. Partnership means real give-and-take, a willingness to see each other through difficulties and problems. It implies an effort at understanding, free and open debate, utter candor, a respect for essential character and integrity. It does not object to tensions but tries to make them creative. The college and its public must together learn to distinguish between lasting ideals and immediate pressures. The college must wish to be as relevant as it can to the life around it. Likewise, the community that boasts of its liberal arts college must not want—and the business men I know do not want—a college to be less than it ought to be. . . .

"Now," Lowry declared, "the task of the public relations officer is, I should think, to understand this two dimensional arrangement and to help others to understand it—and to win for an institution of learning the true partnership and support that comes from this understanding. . . . If he is to interpret this tension-filled, exciting, two-dimensional world of the college, he must be involved, and from the beginning, in all institutional planning. He must help dream the dreams before they are handed to him and become his nightmares. Just as a development officer would not be allowed to saddle a college with some embarrassing sudden grant just because he could shake it down, so in turn, the college should not hand him unwise and impossible assignments born of aims and purposes he has had no part in considering and formulating. In short, public relations and development officers should be educators sharing in the educational process. . . . Unless a man can rise beyond all the tricks of his trade into this other role of educator in the best sense, he will be inadequate. Indeed, the most practical thing a development man can be is, first of all, a visionary. Why, in heaven's name, with all the irksome jobs he has to do, would he ever consent to be less? What we can all use, of course, is a new and enlarged conception of the word 'development' itself—in which it means, not just the pursuit of money, but the care and the enhancement of the total welfare and significance of an institution."[35]

The traditional sessions for the various types of institutions (private, public, church-related, etc.), the "new look" sessions based on 1,500-2,000-word papers submitted by members, and workshops built around entries received in the National Honors Competition occupied the conference registrants during a major part of the conference. The National Honors Competition drew ninety-four case studies and 695 publications in 1966. Ten entries were awarded $250 certificates of exceptional achievement and incentive grants made possible by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. The recipients were Abilene Christian College, Marquette University, Washington University, Clark University, Westminster (Missouri) College, University of Chicago, Gustavus Adolphus College, Michigan State University, University of Pennsylvania, and Pacific Lutheran University. In addition, seventy-two certificates of special merit were awarded, twenty in the case studies division and fifty-two in the publications division.[36]

ACPRA presented national awards at the Boston conference to Indiana University Chancellor Herman B. Wells, Lyle M. Nelson, director of university relations at Stanford, and Roland C. Matthies, vice president and treasurer at Wittenberg University. The award for distinguished service to higher education was given to Wells for service "in key positions of leadership for six national organizations concerned with strengthening higher education. . ." and for "numerous contributions in the field of international relations and in the development of international education programs." Nelson, president of ACPRA in 1960-61, received one of the outstanding achievement awards "in recognition of his national leadership and of his effective and tireless work as director of the 1965 White House Conference on Education" which had been designed "to tap the opinion of educational leadership and to make that opinion known to the President of the United States." Matthies, chairman of the COTP since its creation in 1962, received his award "for his unselfish and dedicated service" during which he "has given freely of his talents and experience to help others solve complex legal and tax problems."

During its meetings in Boston, ACPRA's Board of Trustees made the first grant for research in the Association's history, $10,000 to Willard Hunter, coordinator of development for the Claremont (California) Graduate School and University Center. Hunter, a member of the Association's COTP, had been granted a year's leave of absence by his institution and planned a study on "The Influence of Taxation and Philanthropy." The ACPRA grant would provide the remaining funds Hunter would need for his study, for which $30,000 had been secured from other sources.[37]

The board also commissioned W. Emerson Reck, vice president of Wittenberg University and the oldest member of ACPRA from point of service, to write an official history of the Association's first half century with the hope that the volume could be completed for publication in 1970.[38] Later arrangements were made for the book to cover ACPRA's history until the Association had merged with the American Alumni Council to form the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

In his annual report to the membership at the Boston conference, Leslie was able to say that the Association was in the soundest financial position in its history. The Executive Committee at Cincinnati the previous year had agreed that money remaining in unexpended 1964-65 funds, after $25,000 had been retained for 1965-66 operations, should be placed in a reserve fund not to be expended without Executive Committee approval.

At the Executive Committee's meeting in November, 1965, Leslie presented the national office report, including a thirteen-month audit (because of the fiscal year change). He pointed out that the Association had in hand funds sufficient to cover operating costs while making the change in billing procedures. He also emphasized that the auditors had urged the early creation of a reserve fund of not less than $50,000 and an effort to build this reserve to $100,000 as soon as possible. A motion by James Denison that $25,000 of the current surplus (approximately $70,000) be set aside as a reserve fund was approved, after which Nicholson named Denison chairman of a committee to recommend policy for maintenance of the fund.[39]

By trustee action at Boston the Association, whose reserve fund of the early 1960s had later been used to cover current expenses until fee increases provided sufficient income, was able to establish a reserve of $50,000. This action was taken after the trustees had approved the recommendations made by Denison's committee: "(1) that it be the policy and practice of the Association to establish and maintain a reserve fund; (2) that the minimum level of such reserve fund . . . be either $100,000 or fifty percent of the preceding fiscal year's general expenditure budget; (3) that until the level of $100,000 in the reserve fund is attained, there be allocated irrevocably to the reserve fund in the budget for each succeeding fiscal year $10,000 or five percent of the anticipated income, whichever is greater; (4) that such portions of the reserve fund as the Executive Committee may determine be invested in securities or obligations of the United States Government, and the income therefrom be utilized for support of some special project of the Association as designated by the Executive Committee upon the advice and counsel of a committee of the Board of Trustees established for the purpose; (5) that such special projects be designated by a name or names that will give honorable recognition to either a member of the Association for meritorious service or some worthy objective or goal of the Association."[40]

A budget of $166,000 had been adopted for 1965-66 in Cincinnati. However, at the end of the fiscal year, now August 31 instead of July 31, expenditures stood at $186,649. At the same time income had reached $211,679, giving the Association opportunity to boost the reserve fund to $50,000 without likelihood of financial pinch. Worthy of note was the fact that $33,859 of the year's expenditures had gone into publications.[41]

As Pat Nicholson gave at Boston the last address of his presidency, he sought, as did most of his predecessors, to warn his colleagues of the challenges ahead.

"We must," he said, "be better and more broadly trained in psychology, law, and communications—in legislative relations, economics, and many another specialty—if we are to carry out our future responsibilities; as a corollary, existing skills should be regularly examined and sharpened . . . . As we are drawn more deeply into the war against poverty and ignorance, ACPRA representatives will have to broaden their understanding of the social sciences, of city planning and redevelopment, of how to apply available resources against all the ills of urban blight. The larger institutions will probably evolve new specialists in such fields as community relations, contract negotiation, and liaison with governmental agencies. Many of us will find ourselves or our superiors on the governing boards of community and regional agencies dealing with various aspects of economic deprivation and opportunity . . . .

"Once again the need is for better training and better performance in response to new demands, harsher challenges, tougher competition. Harry Truman said it pretty well: 'If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen'. Cooler kitchens are apparently not in prospect; consequently, we had better look to more capable cooks.

"ACPRA has moved strongly ahead in recent years in the ability to serve its members and their representatives. At the same time, the problems and responsibilities that confront us have grown in number and complexity.

" 'Fools are never uneasy', Goethe once remarked. As wise men, it behooves us to realize that the years to 1970 and on will hardly be tranquil ones. They are shaping up instead as a time of turbulent growth and remarkable opportunity, a time in which all of us, institutional members, representatives, and the Association itself, may have to choose between mediocrity and a far higher level of achievement."[42]

Challenges To Run Faster

Before leaving Boston following the national conference there in July, 1966, ACPRA's Board of Trustees and Executive Committee had made plans which would make 1966-67 a fitting climax to the organization's first fifty years.

When the trustees for 1966-67 held their organization meeting on July 4, A. Westley Rowland of the State University of New York at Buffalo was elevated to the presidency after serving a year as president-elect, and Dyar Massey of Emory University, secretary-treasurer for the last four years, was named president-elect. Fred C. Hess of Grinnell College, whose service in half a dozen posts had greatly contributed to ACPRA's numerical growth in recent years, was elected secretary-treasurer.

Remaining members of the Executive Committee for this memorable year were Patrick J. Nicholson, the immediate past president; Greta Murphy of Milwaukee School of Engineering, Michael Radock of the University of Michigan, David S. Thompson of Princeton University, and John Leslie, *ex officio*.[43]

Rowland by background and experience was well-equipped to lead the Association during its fiftieth year. He had begun his career as a high school teacher of speech, then was professor of speech at Alma (Michigan) College until World War II, when he served as an instructor with the Navy. After the war he returned to Alma with the added duties of director of publicity. Following seven years in that post, he moved to Michigan State University as editor of the news bureau. Within six months he moved through the position of executive news editor to that of university editor. After seven years in that position he became assistant to the president of the State University of New York at Buffalo. He still held this title when elected president of ACPRA but within two months became executive assistant to the president of SUNYB.

Rowland's dissertation for a Doctor of Education degree earned at Michigan State in 1955 was entitled "Selected Factors in the Public Relations Programs of Colleges and Universities in the United States." In ACPRA his service included two years as chairman of the Public Relations Council and that of general program chairman and director of the 1962 national conference at White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia.

One of Rowland's largest assets was "a great sense of humor." In consequence, he was in constant demand as a speaker, and one of his most popular subjects was "The Indispensable Ingredient—a Sense of Humor."[44]

ACPRA, which had been organized by twenty-five persons from twenty-three institutions fifty years earlier, saw its institutional membership push well above 1,000 in 1967. As reported by Executive Vice President John Leslie at the fiftieth anniversary conference in Dallas, approximately 3,200 individuals from 1,044 educational institutions held membership. Of these forty-three came from twenty-three institutions in Canada, Colombia, Japan, Mexico, Brazil, Puerto Rico, and South Africa.[45]

Earlier in the year, when the number of members representatives stood at 3,058, a survey showed that about 100 different kinds of titles were being used, although the number was decreasing. Members by titles included 206 presidents, 259 vice presidents, 127 assistants to presidents, and twenty-eight deans. A further check showed 469 of the individual members with public relations, 722 with development, 449 with information or news, 197 with publications, and 156 with alumni included in their titles.[46]

At the close of its fiftieth year ACPRA, which had seen its treasury all but empty four years earlier, was able to report a new worth of $153,456. This figure included $78,414 in the reserve fund, which had been established only one year earlier with an initial figure of $25,000 (later raised to $50,000) and $3,524 in the endowment fund, which had been growing slowly since 1963. The Executive Committee in July, 1966, had set a revised budget of $201,000 but expenditures, largely because of the outlay for educational conference programs, had grown to $255,183. However, income, including $48,470 from educational conference programs, had jumped to $304,082. Expenses for publications had continued to climb and stood at $39,507.[47]

Grants for the first time became a major source of ACPRA support in 1966-67. Of the $58,100 received from six grants, $43,000 came from the Esso Foundation. The funds were given to support the continuation and completion of the management study which ACPRA had initiated in 1965 with the belief that colleges and universities needed to give greater attention to standards of administration and management for their advancement programs. With Charles Newton of California Institute of Technology as study director and James M. Shea of the University of Oregon on leave to assist, the project had gotten underway during the preceding year with the mailing of questionnaires to 1,058 institutions. Still to be completed were in-depth, on-campus interviews, analysis and computer translation of the questionnaire and interview information, and publication of results. Hopefully, publication would be achieved by late 1967 and provide up-to-date terms and standards which would enable institutions to exchange information on efficient management practices.[48]

The Sears, Roebuck Foundation, whose grants had enabled ACPRA to expand its National Honors Competition starting in 1965, increased its grant to $7,500, thus assuring each award winner a prize of $500 and providing funds for publication of the leading case studies in book form. To enable the Association to develop a course of study for a proposed new service, a Summer Academy, the United States Steel Foundation provided a grant of $5,000. Two other grants came from Association districts, one of $500 covering the first half of a $1,000-pledge made by the Great Lakes District toward publication of an ACPRA history, and one of $100 from the Far West District to assist in Spanish translations of certain publications. The sixth grant, for $2,000, was received from American City Bureau-Beaver Associates to help in the printing of a tax history by Richard Desmond of LeMoyne College.[49]

The Summer Academy was the major additional service which ACPRA provided members in 1966-67. Plans for the academy were initiated by the Executive Committee at its meeting in September. Then an eight-man committee headed by Abel A. Hanson, general secretary of Columbia University and an ACPRA trustee, developed an outline of work to be covered.

The major objective of the academy would be to help relative newcomers in educational public relations to move forward from the use of basic skills for which they were hired toward positions requiring greater administrative skills. The academy, said its supporters, would be the first step in providing a cohesive, on-going program for the professional growth of educational advancement personnel.

The curriculum, based on an academic orientation requiring advanced readings along with lectures and laboratory sessions, would cover publications, information services, fund raising, and general education. The general education studies would cover academic and administrative structures, budgetary procedures, types of governing boards, physical plant operations, faculty, student and administration relationships, and an introduction to state and national organizations. A comprehensive fee of $230, covering all expenses except travel, was set for the six-day program to be held at the University of Notre Dame's Center for Continuing Education.[50]

When held July 30-August 5, 1967, the academy drew an enrollment of seventy-one "taught" by a faculty of eleven, including three special lecturers. The program was so favorably accepted that it became a regular summer feature of ACPRA services.[51]

The academy was only one of a dozen special programs ACPRA sponsored in 1966-67 in an effort to provide information and training for members in the areas of public relations and development. Included were five institutes, three summer workshops, two workshops on deferred giving held in connection with district meetings, and the School for Public Relations, Development, and Alumni Relations Officers held in conjunction with the annual national conference. The institutes, each concentrating on a different subject "from the management standpoint," were held over a three-week period in March and April. They drew a total of 366 registrants for programs on "Interpretative Writing for Colleges and Universities," "Planning and Administering Internal Relations," "Administering the Advancement Program," "The Volunteer in a Capital Campaign, "and "Administering the Publications Program," held in College Park, Maryland; Chicago, New York, Atlanta, and San Francisco, respectively. The Chicago institute was the first ACPRA had sponsored on the subject of internal relations.[52]

The summer workshops included one on information services held at the University of Denver, one on publications at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and one on educational fund raising at Loretto Heights College, Denver. The workshop programs were approved only after the Executive Committee had laid down ground rules which called for the planning, budgeting, faculty selection, and programming to be done with the approval of the Executive Committee and all registration procedures to be handled by the national office.[53] The workshops on deferred giving were held in conjunction with the conferences of the Far West and Pacific Northwest Districts.[54]

The last of the special programs, the School for Public Relations, Development and Alumni Relations Officers, was held July 23-24 preceding the national conference in Dallas. With a faculty of ten and Robert J. Sailstad of Davidson College as director, the school sought to be "a brief intensive review of fundamentals and proven techniques designed for those who wish to sharpen their skills." Featured were a publications laboratory running throughout the two days "for persons wishing criticisms of or help with publications" and a case study on "New Programs in Public Relations and Development for a New College" presented by representatives of Florida Presbyterian College.[55]

Publications became a much stronger arm of ACPRA's program in 1966-67. Twenty-nine of the award-winning case studies from the National Honors Competition of 1966 provided the third volume of *Award-Winning Case Studies*, financed in part by the grant from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. To the list of special publications the Association had produced in recent years was added *Higher Education and Tax-Motivated Giving*, Robert Desmond's study financed by the grant from the American City Bureau-Beaver Associates.

ACPRA's new bimonthly, *Techniques*, was a gold mine of ideas with more than fifty articles, most of them from the "new look" sessions of the 1966 national conference. The January-February issue, however, was devoted entirely to papers which had been presented at workshops held under the aegis of the Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy in connection with district coventions in 1965-66. The twenty-page issue also included a basic bibliography of books, booklets, and periodic publications for the educational development officer and a glossary of deferred giving terms.

Under Brent Breedin, who had become editor with the summer issue of 1966, *College and University Journal* continued to be ACPRA's bellweather publication, with an even greater diversity of content and a broader spectrum of authors. Nearly half of the quarterly's articles were written by members of the Association. The list of authors also included such names as Marshall McLuhan, George Boas, Miller Upton, Sir Eric Ashby, Ray Heffner, John W. Gardner, and Samuel B. Gould.

For the Association's fiftieth anniversary on April 6, 1967, the spring issue of *College and University Journal* included a sixteen-age insert which told much of the Association's history through excerpts from past publications. Of special interest were the illustrated biographical sketch of founder T. T. Frankenberg, his presidential speech of January 3, 1920, and his silver anniversary prophecy; the listing of those who participated in the founding meeting of April 6, 1917; the first Standards of Practice adopted in 1928; a summary of the Greenbrier Conference report of 1958, and tables showing the growth of higher education in number of institutions, enrollment, degrees granted, total expenditures, current income, endowment, and private gifts between 1917 and 1966.

This anniversary issue also contained two articles of special interest, "Temptations in College Public Relations" by Gould, at that time chancellor of the State University of New York, and "The Oldest Profession?" by Robert V. Cramer, vice president for development at Hanover College. Acknowledging that the phrase, "the oldest profession," was often used in reference to another livelihood, Cramer nevertheless presented facts which indicated that educational development had been practiced for some 960 years before 1967.

Fragments of letters found in the Cairo Genizah of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America proved, according to Cramer, that organized fund raising for education had been undertaken as early as 1007 A. D. The fund-raising procedures followed at that time showed surprising similarity to those of 1967.

"The academy at Pumbedita (near Baghdad) had found itself in financial straits and an emergency appeal had been issued by its principal, Hai Gaon," Cramer wrote. "The leaders of the community consulted Taherti (Moses ben Barhum Taherti, head of a prominent family of Kairouan, later Tunisia) and in his letter (found hidden in an ancient synagogue near Cairo in 1896) Taherti related how he had instructed them to conduct the campaign to raise the moneys for the academy. . . .

"As a first step Taherti had advised the community leaders to persuade a certain Ibrahim ben Ata to lead the united appeal. Ben Ata, as both a physician and a courtier of the Sultan, would indeed appear to be the 'right man to head the campaign'—one whose influence would carry weight in the community.

"Ben Ata," Cramer continued, "was reluctant to accept the responsibility. Yet Taherti, convinced that ben Ata's cooperation was essential to the appeal's success, persisted. He writes: 'I told them this matter requires cooperation and unity . . . through his joining us unity will be created and there will be general agreement'. Finally, Taherti triumphed and he reported elatedly: 'We did not delay. We developed a plan and we approached him. I awakened his interest through open and hidden ways until he accepted'.

"With ben Ata as its head the campaign was an assured success. He himself made a handsome leading contribution (of course); his lead was followed; and 'much money was collected'."

Researcheers, Cramer asserted, had been plagued by the phrase, "open and hidden ways," Then, burrowing deeper in later correspondence, they seemed to find the answer.

"Ben Ata," said Cramer, "was now referred to with a new title of respect—Naggid or Negid ha-Gola, a mark of high esteem implying a princely patron. He had, in effect, been given an honorary degree."[56]

For an article on "Temptations in College Public Relations," Samuel Gould of SUNY drew on more than thirty years of experience in public relations at various levels. These years had included work with Providence and Hartford radio stations, association with Boston University's School of Public Relations while director of the Division of Radio and assistant to the president at the university; service as president of Antioch College and of the Educational Broadcasting Corporation, and service as chancellor at both the University of California at Santa Barbara and at the State University of New York.

"The public relations officer," Gould asserted, "can easily succumb to a whole series of temptations which will keep him inordinately busy and even supremely happy while he is doing little or nothing about what really matters. . . . There is, for example, the temptation of *wishful thinking*. This is not limited to the public relations officer alone, but it is most dangerous to him since he has the major responsibility for interpreting his institution. Such a temptation leads him toward constructing an image of his college or university as it should be rather than as it is. . . .

"Another temptation is that of *relying upon techniques*. This is hard to resist, since the public relations officer usually prides himself upon his abilities as a practitioner. . . . His own particular emphasis in his work will invariably depend on his previous experience, much of which may well have been in other than academic surroundings. Whatever his particular skills, the temptation lies in considering the techniques as the ends rather than as the means.

"An additional temptation among the many we could list is that of *separating our total public relations problem into segments* and dealing with each portion independently of the others. . . . When this practice is followed for a time, the general result is the disappearance of any semblance of overall policy. Every problem becomes a problem of the moment and has no implications beyond itself; it therefore contributes nothing to understanding the total philosophy of the institution since it has been dealt with in complete isolation from that of philosophy and with no reference to it. . . .

"A more fanciful temptation is that of *indulging in the practice of esoteric journalism*. This is something the public relations officer shares with many other practitioners, the desire to surround what he does with an aura of mystery and difficulty. . . . If one explains a task in clear and simple terms, a certain portion of its difficulty seems to disappear, and since we all dearly love to give the impression that whatever we do is extremely complicated and calls for the ultimate in technical skill, we are tempted to keep as much as possible to ourselves.

"A much more serious temptation is one of *compromising with the opposition on fundamental issues*. . . . The public relations officer has a great yearning for tranquility, and understandably so. He longs for peace and quiet on his campus, and the temptation comes in what he is willing to give in order to achieve such peace and quiet. . . . Sometimes he is insufficiently aware that the serene campus may also be the intellectually-sterile campus and that the goal of serenity may be a delusion. When this is the case, he is that much more easily the victim of temptation, for there are innumerable opportunities for him to compromise with principle for the sake of maintaining a smoothly running and socially acceptable organization."

The real question, Gould said, now became, "How can such temptations be resisted?" To this question, he declared, he could offer no surefire formulas.

"All I can do," he asserted, "is make some general comments on a few of the directions your work might pursue. In doing so, I suppose I am characterizing what I would expect of a public relations officer in my own institution, or to put it another way, the basis on which I would measure his ability and effectiveness.

"First of all," he continued, "I would expect the public relations officer to be *educationally aware*. This seems like a vague phrase, but in reality it is anything but vague. It places the public relations officer squarely in the center of the educational process and anticipates that he will keep himself informed and current on academic movements and problems of our times. He should be able to examine these broadly and to contribute when they are being discussed in the councils of his institution. He can, in fact, add a dimension to their discussion; since he can relate these movements and problems to outside reactions more expertly than anyone else.

". . . the public relations man must be a *believer*. His sense of commitment to higher education and to the role of his institution in furthering such education must be equal to that of everyone else in a position of leadership. . . . It is not enough, however, to rely on belief and commitment as philosophical imperatives. These must be converted into a series of direct actions that lay *a solid foundation capable of holding up under adverse circumstances*.

"One of the most crucial of these direct actions to help strengthen the foundation for acceptance is that of *providing facts with clarity, frankness, and honesty*. It would seem that this is a rule of procedure so obvious that it needs no mention, yet many of the public relations troubles of colleges and universities stem from an unwillingness to abide by such a rule. . . .

"Not only should facts be offered clearly and honestly, but care should be taken to prepare the public for such facts. . . . It does little good to wring one's hands tragically when a boisterous demonstration occurs or a handful of students are apprehended with drugs in their possession if the university or college has previously done nothing of a positive sort about such problems. And if it has, the press and others should long since have been called in and made aware of what these efforts are and what they are designed to achieve. . . .

"Finally, the public relations officer, to be effective, must be *close to the sources of philosophy and power*. He must be so situated in the administrative and academic hierarchy that he is present when important policy decisions are being made. If possible, he should have a voice in making them, at least to the extent of pointing out their internal and external public relations implications. . . .

"It goes without saying," Gould concluded, "that if the public relations officer is to enjoy this kind of proximity to the decision-making process, his own loyalty and discretion must never be open to question. He cannot talk confidentially to anyone inside or outside his institution in criticism or disagreement with those to whom he is responsible without soon forfeiting his place at the council table. Even more important, he cannot do this without demeaning himself and his institution with ultimate serious harm to both. This is not to take from him the opportunity to question any decision openly when it is being discussed. But once the policy is determined, he should either support it or, finding it impossible to do so, should go elsewhere where the policies are more to his liking."[57]

When Breedin became editor of *College and University Journal* he established a new feature, "Surveys and Opinion," in which he ran each month one or more brief articles, most of them dealing with individual studies on public relations. One study, completed under the auspices of the U. S. Office of Education, showed that "most people are 'for' higher education because it will benefit them financially, but they have virtually no idea of what it's all about or its potential effects on society." This was true because colleges were "talking over the heads of the public" when they needed to "meet John Public on his own terms, speak to him in his own language, make him realize that education and educators are human."

Another survey revealed that "the number of public relations personnel called upon to advise yearbooks declines as the institution's enrollment increases" but that public relations practitioners were still being called upon to serve as yearbook advisers in nearly one-third of the institutions surveyed.[58]

A survey concerning the values of mass third-class mailings by college public relations departments produced these conclusions: "(1) such mailings, to people with only a tangent interest, receive little or no attention; (2) of the few people who read, less than half get the message; (3) printed matter, sent 'cold', does not always impress wealthy and influential people; (4) editors do not mine the gold in college brochures or lengthy reports; (5) it's the content that counts."[59]

A study made by Paul E. Corn of Indiana University as the basis for a doctoral dissertation in education emphasized that "inadequate job descriptions and poor contact with presidents are major frustrations of development and public relations men." The article was based on information secured on questionnaires answered by 128 college presidents and 153 public relations directors. Corn said that neither the presidents of small colleges (those with enrollments up to 2,000) nor their public relations directors revealed a consensus concerning the overall public relations program. The probable reasons for their lack of agreement, he said, "are essentially due to semantic confusion, philosophical differences, individual needs of colleges, and a failure to develop a consistent concept of public relations."

Corn concluded, "Although the job description can transform the public relations officer's confusion into a general understanding of the tasks to be performed, his frustrations cannot be completely relieved until he and the president set task priorities. This calls for the best of communication and relations between the two. Without these jointly set priorities there may be no specific emphasis or the wrong projects may be emphasized; there may be a great waste of time, effort, and resources. The institution suffers most as a result of poor planning and confusion. Such institutions eventually have to fight for their very existence because, if the president and his staff members continually fail to solve the problems in this area which concerns the development strength and public image of the institution, the academic strength of the college is not likely to fare much better. Such a college may feel the doomsday prophets spoke the truth and that its decline was preordained."[60]

In another trenchant article, Roy J. Leffingwell of Honolulu, president of the Pan Pacific Public Realtions Association, said in summary: "The chief operating head of every organization is in fact the public relations man. We practitioners are advisers and consultants. To do an effective job in this capacity our advice must encompass every element which affects mass human behavior. If we do not have authority to counsel on all of these elements we are not public relations advisers. We may be communications advisers, advertising advisers, or advisers in some other specialty—but we are not public relations practitioners."[61]

Because of the growing emphasis being placed on publications, ACPRA brought Robert E. Miss, former newspaper reporter and more recently a member of Fordham University's public relations office, to the national office as an editorial assistant in September, 1966. The national office staff now included ten persons, four of them professionals.[62]

Activities of three major committees—Taxation and Philanthropy, Professional Advancement, and International Relations—expanded again in 1966-67 under the continued leadership of Roland C. Matthies, Edward P. VonderHaar, and James S. Triolo, respectively. In addition to sponsoring deferred giving workshops in connection with meetings of the Far West and Pacific Northwest Districts, the Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy was instrumental in organizing the 501(c)(3) Group, an ad hoc committee on taxation and philanthrophy made up of executives of tax-exempt national organizations interested in taxation as it affected philanthropy. This group kept a close eye on proposed state and national legislation. In subsequent years, it was influential in guiding the thinking of legislative committees charged with drafting tax laws. The COTP also sponsored a tax briefing for ACPRA members in connection with the 1967 national conference and supported Abel Hanson, a member of the committee, in a study he was making called "Guiding Principles for the Use of Tax Incentives in Fund Raising."[63]

Meanwhile, Willard Hunter, also a member of Matthies' committee, continued work on the study of the effects of tax exemption on philanthropy. Results of this study, partially financed by a $10,000 grant from ACPRA itself, would be published in 1968, Hunter announced in a preliminary report at the Association's 1967 conference. In this report, Hunter revealed that he had interviewed the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate, fourteen key government administrators, and thirty of forty-seven donors who had made contributions of more than one million dollars each in 1965.

The donors, whose capital gifts had totaled $96,445,000 in that year, had told Hunter that their overall contributions would have been forty million dollars less if tax deductibility for charitable gifts had been eliminated. Hunter also reported that he had found tax legislators "disposed to keep a status quo on income tax deductions for contributions to colleges, hospitals, and other public agencies."[64]

Next, VonderHaar's Committee on Professional Advancement came forward with a comprehensive report. As a result, the Association's Executive Committee authorized the national office to produce a brochure for high school and college guidance counselors citing the advantages and opportunities in the field of educational public relations. Also approved was a recommendation that ACPRA's publications be made available to institutions offering degrees or courses in public relations. In addition, the Association would seek to remind institutions of the need to include specialized training for development officers in their public relations courses. The Association was also urged to encourage fellowships and scholarships in public relations and act as a clearinghouse on such opportunities in educational public relations. Meanwhile, individual members of the Association were encouraged to attend high school career days as representatives of the advancement profession.[65]

Through the efforts of the Committee on International Relations, ACPRA for the first time sent a team of consultants into Mexico to provide counseling on public relations and development for an institution of that country. Making the trip in December, 1966, the team gave assistance to the Board of Trustees of Centro de Ensenanza Technica y Superior of Mexicala in Baja California.[66] Later, the committee assisted in counseling the Brazilian government in its effort to develop an advisory program for its eighteen universities. The committee also proposed and the Executive Committee approved the preparation of Spanish translations of all three volumes of case studies published since 1964.[67]

The work of major committees seemed to fall heavily on a small number of members year after year. Therefore, the Executive Committee in September, 1966, adopted a rotation policy stipulating that: "1) committeemen shall be appointed for three-year terms. . . . and no committeeman shall serve more than two consecutive terms; 2) committee chairmen may serve two terms when advisible and such terms need not be concurrent; and 3) the president, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may abolish any committee not serving a useful function."[68]

Following a lengthy review of the Association's bylaws, ACPRA's trustees initiated a series of changes which were later approved by the membership at the annual meeting in July, 1967. These changes eliminated the practice of counting subscribers as members; deleted the article—never implemented—referring to a Board of Advisers; deleted the word "treasurer" wherever it appeared; designated the president-elect rather than the secretary as chairman of the Fianance Committee, and added a section defining who a voting member was and how he was elected.

Cooperative efforts of ACPRA and the AAC during 1966-67 concentrated on the joint lending library and preparations for the national conference which the two organizations had decided to hold in Miami, Florida, in 1968. A committee composed of three persons from each organization inspected and evaluated the lending library, then recommended steps meant to strengthen the library's services to members of both associations. These steps included creation of a three-member staff composed of a director, assistant, and secretary, and adoption of a budget of approximately $32,000, exclusive of rent and maintenance. The director would devote most of his time to development and promotion of the library, while the assistant would be responsible for day-to-day operations. Through studies of existing programs, research concerning specific problems, and projection of trends, the enlarged library would devote considerable time to applied research into the future of public relations, development, and alumni work. ACPRA's trustees endorsed the recommendations, then requested the Association's president to discuss them with AAC's president in an effort to develop an experimental plan of action to be evaluated after three years. Thus the extension of library services was expected to become one of the major projects of ACPRA as its second half-century of service began.[69]

Patrick Nicholson was named as ACPRA's liaison with AAC to assure that the joint conference in 1968, for which AAC was taking major responsibility, would include program features of interest to ACPRA members.[70] While thinking of the 1968 conference, the trustees also looked ahead to the conferences of 1969 and 1970. James Triolo was appointed to serve as chairman for the 1969 joint conference, at which ACPRA would be the host in New York,[71] and Denver was chosen as the site of the 1970 national conference. As indicated earlier, AAC had requested that a year be allowed for evaluation of the joint-conference plan following the 1969 meeting. ACPRA's Executive Committee hoped, however, that the combined-conference plan could be resumed in 1971 with a meeting in Washington, D. C.[72]

The trustees and the Executive Committee also began to look ahead three years at the financial picture. Although John Leslie reported that the Association soon would need increased income to meet advancing costs for personnel and services, the Executive Committee agreed that henceforth junior colleges should be admitted to membership for a flat fee of $100 with the fee for additional member representatives remaining at $35.[73] At their meeting in April, 1967, the trustees and Executive Committee adopted a tentative budget of $227,000 for 1967-68. At the same time a three-year budget projection was presented by President Rowland with $248,000 the estimated figure for 1969-70.[74]

As the 1966-67 trustees had determined at their initial meeting during the Boston conference, the matter of name change was placed before the membership. In accordance with procedure planned at that time, the issues would be debated pro and con at each district meeting, after which a mail ballot would be conducted beginning March 1, 1967, giving voting representatives a choice between the present name and the proposed name, "Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities." To give members good background for their decisions, ballots would be accompanied by a statement presenting arguments in favor of both options. Voting would be closed on March 31, after which ballots would be counted by an outside auditing firm. If adopted, the new name would become effective September 1, 1967.[75]

Although the trustees were strongly in favor of the change, they and the national office did everything possible to present the case fairly to the membership. The *Newsletter* for November, 1966, devoted more than one of its four pages to the upcoming vote. The issue for January, 1967, carried side by side without comment the statements which would accompany the ballot on March 1.

The statement in favor of retaining the present name read: "The name 'American College Public Relations Association' has served the Association well for twenty years and there is no need to change it now. Public relations is a relatively new profession, but one which is growing constantly in strength, effectiveness, and acceptance. Public relations is the umbrella under which all our members function, no matter what specific area we work in—whether it be management, publications, information, fund raising, planning, or alumni relations.

"The proposed name would indicate too much dominance of the Association by those whose primary concern is fund raising rather than the broader field of interpreting our colleges and universities to the many publics through the printed and spoken word.

"While all may agree that a change in name is desirable, they do not like the name recommended and are therefore willing to retain the present name. The proposed new name is both vague and pretentious. There is an implication that public relations and development officers should somehow replace the presidents and governing boards in their desire for identification with 'advancement of colleges and universities'.

"The present Association name describes the activities of a sizeable majority of our members far better than any other title. Faced with some misuse and remaining misunderstanding of the term 'public relations', ACPRA is proposing to abandon the phrase and adopt another title. If we change the name, we will have to go through a lengthy process of explaining, justifying, and advertising it so that people will recognize and understand the new name."

The statement in support of the proposed name, "Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities," read: "This is the name your Board of Trustees recommends to the membership for adoption. It is the result of several years of patient thought and research. Hundreds of names have been suggested and evaluated, and the above, in the opinion of those members and officers long associated with the organization who have spent the most time on it, is the best from the standpoint of clarity and avoidance of duplication.

"ACPRA no longer describes accurately the total scope and purpose of our organization, the activities of its member colleges and universities in the broad field of university advancement, or the work of our almost 3,000 member representatives. Artificially (and inaccurately) limiting our proclaimed field to 'public relations' is an increasing burden in seeking new members, in obtaining the grants which our expanding activities now require, in our relationships with other organizations in the important matter of getting speakers for our district and national conferences, and in the organization's ability to act in your behalf in such areas as taxation affecting philanthropy.

"All life reflects change and growth; our membership, objectives, and activities have expanded and shifted in the past forty-nine years. Just as the names 'American Association of College News Bureaus' and 'American College Publicity Association' served their day and were replaced as the Association matured, so now, in the opinion of the board, the time has come to move to a new name that more adequately describes its broadened activities. If adopted by a two-thirds majority of those voting, the new name will become effective September 1, 1967, the fiftieth year of the Association."

As early as September, 1966, the officers had begun to find considerable opposition to the name change. At the meeting of the Executive Committee that month, President Rowland emphasized that there was "opposition to the word 'advancement' in some circles and said that one group—particularly some of the technical schools—prefer the name 'Association for the Advancement of Higher Education'." During the discussion following it was pointed out "that either name is considered to be presumptuous by some—the proposed substitute even more so." Rowland was then instructed to mail the trustees' position paper to all district trustees and district directors as "a basis for communication and discussion with various individuals within the districts."[76]

Quite probably the instrument which ultimately defeated the name-change effort was a strongly-worded letter written by George H. Holsten, Jr., director of public relations at Rutgers University. The letter was printed in the February *Newsletter* "to present the case of those proposing retention of the present name." Holsten's letter read in part:

"My opposition, and that of the university I represent, to the new name proposed for the American College Public Relations Association is simply that it is stupid. It is pompous, presumptuous, and meaningless.

"It is pompous because it is an affront to all the other people who are equally concerned with the advancement of education from the janitors who clean our buildings to the presidents and boards of trustees who have final responsibility for 'advancing' higher education. . . .

"Further, I believe the name is essentially meaningless. A name for our organization or any other should be able to stand on its own feet. It should need no further explanation, but the new name proposed for ACPRA clearly does. I would hate to think of the possibilities for confusion which might arise if the American Alumni Council, the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of University Women, and the American Assciation for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities were meeting concurrently. Which of these, a reasonable person might ask, is the true 'advancer' of higher education?

"Beyond what I consider the innate stupidity of the proposed new name, I oppose it because it seems to me to be an effort to cover up, to disguise, and to hide. I don't think that college and university public relations and development people should hide. They have an important job to do and should be proud of what they are doing. And, furthermore, I cannot possibly believe that, by changing the name to something obscure and meaningless, the disguise becomes sufficient to fool the really sophisticated. I, for one, don't intend to hide—especially behind such a silly false face!

"Honesty and forthrightness are still basic elements of good public relations. The proposed name is an unfortunate departure from that principle!"

When the Executive Committee met on April 13, 1967, the first item of business was President Rowland's announcement that the proposed name change had failed to receive the two-thirds vote needed for adoption. The *Newsletter* for May, 1967, carried on Page One a reproduction of the report made to the Board of Trustees by Main, Lafrentz and Company, certified public accountants, who had mailed ballots to 1,005 member institutions. Of these, 803 had been returned but twenty-seven were called invalid because they had been postmarked after the deadline date, were unmarked, or otherwise carried incomplete information. Of the 776 ballots counted, 401, or about fifty-one percent, favored the name change and 375 were opposed.

In the spring of 1967 ACPRA created three new awards in recognition of outstanding work by members. The first to be approved by the Board of Trustees was an annual Pacemaker Award meant to stimulate competition among the nine districts. Starting in 1968, it would be given to the district judged to have had the most significant program of activities.[77] The second award, made possible by the firm of Frantzreb and Pray Associates, Inc., called for $500 to be given each year to the author whose article in *College and University Journal* had made "the most significant contribution to the broad field of institutional advancement." The award, to be given in 1968 for the first time, would be based on the decision of an independent panel of judges. Except in 1968, all material appearing in the four issues of the *Journal* preceding the national conference would be eligible. For the 1968 Distinguished Article Award only articles appearing in the last three issues before the national conference would eligible.[78]

A tradition of recognizing past presidents of the Association with Dinosaur Awards was established by the Executive Committee at its meeting in April, 1967. These awards, featuring a replica of a dinosaur mounted on a wooden base and personally inscribed, were presented for the first time at the fiftieth anniversary conference in Dallas. Nine of the twenty-eight past presidents still living from among the forty-two who had served the Association were present to receive the awards: W. Emerson Reck, 1940-41; Edward P. VonderHaar, 1952-53; James R. Jordan, 1957-58; Howard S. Curtis, 1958-59; Arthur J. Schaefer, 1961-62; H. Russell Bintzer, 1962-63; Horace W. Hewlett, 1963-64; James H. Denison, 1964-65; and Patrick J. Nicholson, 1965-66. Other living presidents received their awards by mail.[79]

How the award came to bear the figure of a dinosaur and that creature's name has never been clearly established. First to mention the dinosaur as a symbol of the past in ACPRA was T. T. Frankenberg. In a speech at the Silver Anniversary Conference in 1942 he said: "It is inevitable, at such a time as this, that the audience . . . will wonder just why the museum door has opened, what Exhibit 'A' is to be like. A Dinosaur, perhaps . . . "[80]

More likely, however, the Dinosaur Award for past presidents got its name from a thought Jim Denison, at that time president-elect, expressed to Fred Hess in 1964, Responding to a suggestion from Hess that the Association recognize members with twenty-five years of service with a special designation, Denison wrote: "Here at Michigan State we present to each retiring president of our faculty club a miniature dinosaur as a token of his entering into limbo. Something of this sort might be done for those who have had twenty-five years or more of membership. I think it should be kept on the light side. Possibly the establishment of the Order of Dinosaurs, or Great Auks, or something of that sort, would be appropriate."[81] ACPRA did not get around to giving recognition to members of long standing until 1970 and meanwhile the dinosaur designation had been preempted for the past presidents' award.

ACPRA's 1967 award for distinguished service to higher education went to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, which had recently made the largest single grant in its history to strengthen the science programs of twenty liberal arts colleges. The citation read in part: ". . . the Foundation not only recognized the importance of undergraduate science programs but sensed the right time and the right manner to make a significant contribution to a vital and neglected area of American higher education."[82]

The National Honors Competition for 1967 broke all records in the numbers game when 1,067 entries—ninety-six case studies and 971 publications—were received from 377 persons representing 277 institutions. Six of the entries received citations for exceptional achievement and $500 awards from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. Fifty-nine others, twenty-three in the case studies category and thirty-six in the publications category, received citations of special merit.[83]

Definite planning for the Golden Anniversary Conference had started in July, 1966, when President Rowland appointed Edward J. Boling, University of Tennessee, and John Earl Seelig, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, program chairman and conference coordinator, respectively. Half a dozen new policies related to the annual conference, most of them concerning financial matters, were adopted by the Executive Committee at its meeting in September. The Association announced that it "will not, repeat *will not*, be responsible for expenditures beyond the budget items and not approved by the program chairman, conference director, and the executive vice president." The new policies, moreover, called for the conference budget to be approved by these individuals, then submitted to the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees at their fall meetings.[84]

"New Technology in Institutional Advancement" was announced as the theme for the 1967 conference. The overall program promised to explore the uses and effects of the new technology in the areas of public relations, development, information services, publications, and alumni affairs with emphasis on the impact made by computers, data processing, improved communications techniques, and new graphic reproduction methods.[85]

Despite record-breaking July heat, 575 persons registered for the conference when it began on July 25. Each registrant received in his packet of materials a sixteen-page booklet, "ACPRA's First Half Century, 1917-1967," bearing the Association's seal embossed in gold. The booklet contained featured items from the history of ACPRA which W. Emerson Reck of Wittenberg University had been commissioned to write.

The "new look" sessions were program features at Dallas for the third straight year along with workshops built around entries in the National Honors Competition, four sessions on "Applying the New Technology," and addresses entitled "The New Technology and College Administration" and "The Revolution in Electronics Communication." The highlight of Dallas conviviality was a Texas-style barbecue, complete with western entertainment at which the delegates, bedecked with red bandanas, filled their plates at chuck wagons.[86]

Executive Vice President Leslie expressed pride in ACPRA's achievements in his report at the annual business meeting. Worthy of special pride, he said, were the results of the three-year program adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1964. Implementation of that program, he reported, had provided a sound financial base for the Association and given it a healthy reserve fund; led to the establishment of two new periodicals, the monthly *Education Abstracts* and the bimonthly *Techniques;* added qualitatively and quantitatively to the literature of the field through publication of four books, including two devoted to award-winning case studies; made possible the Summer Academy and the School for Public Relations and Development Officers; increased the institute and workshop offerings; improved the *College and University Journal;* enlarged the National Honors Competition; and improved billing and accounting procedures.[87]

At the same time Leslie unveiled seven objectives for the future: "(1) to establish and expand, as need dictates, meaningful training programs for persons new in the field; (2) to work toward the development of a curriculum at the graduate level in some university for institutional advancement officers; (3) to continue to improve placement services for institutions and individuals; (4) to develop a significant library of reference material for all aspects of the institutional advancement field; (5) to add substantive literature to the field; (6) to strengthen district programs by providing leadership facilities for district officers and programming material for conference chairmen; and (7) to be ever mindful of keeping Association publications pertinent to the times."[88]

Introduced at the annual business meeting were the members of the Executive Committee for 1967-68: Dyar Massey, Emory University, president; Michael Radock, Univeristy of Michigan, president-elect; Greta Murphy, Milwaukee School of Engineering, secretary; Duane Dittman, St. Lawrence University; Patrick W. Hogan, Florida State University; James M. Shea, University of Oregon, and John Leslie, executive vice president, *ex officio*.[89]

In his presidential address Westley Rowland declared that, while things had changed "faster and more furiously than ever before in the history of the world," man himself and his concerns "may not have changed enough since the time of our first meeting in Chicago in 1917."[90]

Emphasizing the need for ACPRA members to try to change along with the times, Rowland declared: "There is a managerial revolution going on in higher education and we have to be a part of it. We cannot afford to keep repeating the past—to cling to doing and thinking the way we did ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago. . . . As the Red Queen in *Through the Looking Glass* might tell us, 'It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that.' Somehow ACPRA must help us find a way to run faster."

Rowland told his colleagues that ACPRA must do a better job of developing educational programs for those who wished to enter the field. "The future of the field of educational advancement," he asserted, "is directly related to the quality of young people we can recruit into this field now and in the next few years." Rowland saw the trend to machines continuing as the only feasible means of coping with the mass of detail colleges faced, but ACPRA members, "as experts in human relations," he said, "will have to become more and more concerned with building the proper climate of student-institutional relationships in areas other than routine housekeeping."

On the subject of interpretation, the ACPRA president declared that "a policy of candor offers the prospect of increasing the rationality of university decision. . . . ACPRA must see to it that this trend toward candor continues to mushroom. We must stand on the truth. If we cannot, we may deserve to fall."

Rowland anticipated no shortage of moneys available to meet the higher costs of education, but to secure these funds, he said, "will require the greatest initiative and creativity from all of us, whether we work in private or public sectors of higher education, whether we seek the funds from philanthropy, students and parents, local, state, or federal government."

The president concluded by urging that the Association take the advice which its members had been offering for some time to their individual institutions.

"I recommend," he said, "that a long-range planning committee be appointed to be made up of the best minds in and outside our Association. I recommend further that such a group be given a mandate to draft a comprehensive plan for ACPRA for the next decade, yes for the next fifteeen years.

"Such a plan," he said, "would crystallize for all our membership the goals and objectives of the Association and would set forth positive programs to meet these objectives. With benefit of such a plan and the action which would be brought about over the years, the Association could at last realize its full potential as a dynamic force in the advancement of higher education. . . .

"We can and must move to solve some of the basic questions which have been haunting us for years and to cope with others that are new. Only in this way can we serve higher education better than it has ever been served. Only if we solve our problems can we help see to it that higher education moves unceasingly forward toward meeting its goals and aspirations, not just in the realm of glamorous technologies, but in the hearts and minds of men as well."

Preparing For Broader Service

Dyar Massey, ACPRA's president in 1967-68, was one of the few Association members who could claim that he had no enemy in the world. "We just love him," was the way one close associate summarized the feeling of his friends and co-workers. "I think of him as a very thoughtful, considerate, and sensitive person—a gentleman in every sense of the word, with extra emphasis on the gentle," another co-worker said. "I don't think I ever heard him utter a critical remark concerning any program, institution, or colleague."[91]

Massey, a graduate of the University of Georgia, came to ACPRA's presidency with a background of twenty-eight years in public relations work, first at his alma mater, then at Furman University and Emory University. He had been a member of the Association since 1952 and had served on its Board of Directors or Trustees since 1959, on its Executive Committee since 1961, and from 1962 to 1966 as secretary-treasurer before being named president-elect.[92]

Not for physical height or appearance but for his sense of humor and his ability as a story teller, Massey was sometimes called "ACPRA's Abe Lincoln." He collected and kept a file of stories which he told, in his easy southern drawl, to break the tensions of meetings or to entertain groups, large and small.

No incident better illustrates Dyar's quick wit than one recounted with evident relish by his wife, Nancy, and daughter, Barbara. When Barbara was assigned to bake dinner biscuits as a project in her high school home economics class, the first attempt produced such bad results that the three Masseys "laughed until they were weak." There was, however, a Xeroxed sheet to be filled out with space for a parental comment as well as information on preparation, clean up, etc. Barbara asked her dad to make the comment and with no hesitation he wrote: "I suggest the Portland Cement Organization employ her as a consultant, Dyar Massey." Barbara and her mother thought the comment was great but the teacher was horrified, a fact which gave the Masseys still another hearty laugh.[93]

In planning the Association's activities and services, the Executive Committee and national office staff sought during the Massey administration to determine programs which would carry out the objectives of the organization as stated in its Articles of Organization: "to aid and assist its members in their efforts to improve their relations with the varied constituencies which they serve and to which they are responsible as institutions of higher education . . . to be concerned with all facets of its members' relations both within their respective internal organizations and within the larger communities which they serve . . . to provide the mechanism through which each member may improve its own efforts to advance understanding and support for its educational program."

As a result, plans were quickly adopted calling for an enlarged program of workshops, conferences, and institutes for the period between 1967-1970. The plans for 1967-68 called for two-day workshops on the utilization of television to be held in conjunction with district meetings; a national symposium on "The Changing Patterns of Foundation Interest and Support" to be held in Washington in March; the annual national conference in Miami Beach in July; and the second annual Summer Academy to be held at the University of Notre Dame in late July and early August. The schedule for 1968-69 and 1969-70 would be similar except that a publications institute would be added for October and the subjects for the district-related workshops would be changed with fund raising receiving emphasis in 1968-69 and special events in 1969-70. The national symposium for 1969 would also concentrate on a different subject, "The Management and Administration of Public Relations and Development Programs." The subject for 1970 was still undetermined.

The three-year plan had a good start with more than 400 members attending the workshops held in conjunction with seven of the nine district meetings. The national symposium on foundation support planned for March was ultimately rescheduled for December, 1968, and the Summer Academy in 1968, designed primarily for newcomers in the Association, drew seventy-four registrants for a week-long study of the theory and mechanics of institutional advancement.[94] Congressman John Brademas of Indiana was included among the academy's ten faculty members.

The major conference of the year was, as ususal, the national meeting, particularly interesting this year because it was to be held jointly with the American Alumni Council. Registrations from the two organizations were not announced separately, but a total of 1,350 persons came to hear more than 300 speakers and panelists in what was by far the largest conference to date. So large, in fact, was the attendance that ACPRA registrants were scattered among nearly twenty hotels. To help all members hear reports on the state of the Association, closed circuit television was used for the first time. Although this program was aired at 7:30 a.m. and technical troubles were experienced in many sets, the membership was pleased with this imaginative method of reporting.[95]

Long-range planning during 1967-68 went considerably beyond a three-year schedule of conferences. Discussions at meetings of the Executive Committee and board throughout the year led in July, 1968, to authorization for the next president, Michael Radock, to name a Long-Range Planning Committee. It would be charged with examining the Association's goals and objectives, programs, activities, and financial planning. The committee's report, to be made within two years, was expected to help the Association make better projections "in consideration of changing patterns in higher education—the growth of institutions, the increasing percentage of students enrolling in tax-assisted institutions, the widespread development of community colleges, the increasing use of data processing in storing and retrieving information, and the enlarged demands being made on higher education in all areas."[96]

Meanwhile, the Executive Committee at its meeting in September, 1967, had taken steps to establish a three-year pilot program of internships. As planned by the Committee on Professional Advancement, now headed by Clarence Whitefield of Duke University, the program would provide twelve ten-week internships, three each in information services, development, alumni affairs, and publications. Participants would be junior- and senior-year students, who would receive compensation of from $80 to $100 a week paid by the sponsoring college or university. Successful completion of an intership would bring a $500 award to each intern. By July, 1968, Whitefield was able to report that twelve institutions had indicated a desire to participate in the program, which was planned to start in the summer of 1969, hopefully with foundation support.[97]

Planning for the future, the Board of Trustees authorized the national office to retain a management counsel to study internal operations including the office's procedures for mailings and maintaining membership records. As a result, a computerized list maintenance program was introduced to provide information faster and more accurately with a limited staff.[98]

Services of the Association to member institutions and individual members were further expanded in 1967-68, in part through a new district assistance plan and in part through additional general activities. The district assistance plan, financed largely by the national office, brought district directors and program chairmen together for two-day orientation sessions. Those of the western districts met in Denver in April and those of the eastern districts met in Washington in May.[99]

ACPRA continued publication of its bimonthly *Placement Letter*. In order to provide greater service for institutions looking for qualified people and for members seeking new positions or greater opportunity, it linked up with the Educational Career Service of Princeton, New Jersey. Through this arrangement individual member representatives of ACPRA could, at low cost, have their credentials and career aspirations exposed automatically to each position vacancy shown in the personnel and position bank maintained by ECS. Through the Princeton organization, ACPRA could also initiate searches for professional staff which member institutions were seeking in the broad field of public relations and development.[100] The national office also arranged for individuals interested in placement to consult with members of the U.S. Employment Service at district meetings. This service proved to be of such significance that steps were taken to make it available at the national conference.[101]

At its meeting in September, the 1967-68 Board of Trustees took a step which made available to members in later years a steady flow of material, especially of the "how to" variety. This service came as a result of increasing requests for periodicals and articles, many now out of print. It called for the publication of Association literature on microfiche or hard copies from microfiche. By spring, copies of all previous publications of the Association had been processed on microfiche for a total cost of $375 and it was expected that by early the next year copies of any or all past literature could be made available to members at a nominal cost.[102]

For the activities of the Committee on International Relations, the Board of Trustees set aside $2,949 for 1967-68. Under the direction of Chairman James Triolo the committee, in cooperation with representatives of Latin American universities, selected forty-nine case studies from among winning entries in National Honors Competitions of the past four years and prepared to translate them into Spanish. With partial aid from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation and the Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara, the studies would be published in book form early in 1969. As a further service to Latin American institutions and interested individuals the committee conducted a special workship in Spanish during the joint AAC-ACPRA national conference in Miami Beach, then started plans for offering similar programs in key cities of Latin America. Instead of $2,949, committee expenses totaled only $1,040 for the year.[103]

Concern over a growing inclination by Congress to consider proposals which would decrease or eliminate tax benefits for donors to charitable institutions led ACPRA's Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy to broaden its activities in 1967-68. First, COTP arranged for a committee member to make a brief presentation on present and prospective policies of the IRS at each of the nine district meetings. Next the committee pledged to write a series of articles on tax-related subjects for the Association's bimonthly "how to" publication, *Techniques*, starting in the spring, and recommended that a Tax Academy similar to the Summer Academy be scheduled starting in the summer of 1969. The board endorsed the plan and instructed the national staff and the committee to make a further study of possibilities with the suggestion that special emphasis be placed on deferred giving.[104] Through the committee's chairman, Roland Matthies, a slide program on deferred giving was also prepared and made available to institutions.

The methods used by some institutions to emphasize tax advantages to donors were held by the committee to be "ill advised" and as a consequence the first of the articles prepared for *Techniques* dealt with "Tax Ethics." The author, Abel A. Hanson, professor of higher education at Teachers College at Columbia University, condemned "the blatant use of tax benefits as the featured element in fund-raising programs."

"The purpose of a development program, strictly defined," Hanson wrote, "is by means of gifts to finance a cause or an institution for the performance of an essential service to society. . . . The most successful strategy seeks to relate the individual and his purposes to the institutional purpose and the services to be performed. . . . As a principle of service to both donor and receiver, an ethical fund raiser helps the donor to find that prudent arrangement of personal affairs which makes taxes as low as possible and gifts as high as desirable. In the process he will not resort to that kind of reprehensible cleverness which leads the donor to believe that he can save money by making gifts. He will consult counsel on legal and technical problems which arise, and he will encourage the donor to advise with counsel other than that available to and used by the fund raiser."[105]

ACPRA literature, soon to be made available to members through the microfiche process approved early in the year, grew in 1967-68 with the publication of a cumulative index for the first six volumes of *College and University Journal*; a similar index for the year-old *Techniques*; T. Willard Hunter's *The Tax Climate for Philanthropy* in both paper and hardback; and Volume IV of *Award-Winning Case Studies*, this one containing synopses of winning entries in the 1967 National Honors Competition.[106]

The *Journal*, one of the Association's five periodicals, grew in popularity as a result of

Brent Breedin's editorial touch and the quality of its content. The new Distinguished Article Award of $500 encouraged members to submit articles and gave Breedin greater opportunity to pick and choose. The first award, that for 1968, went to Peter Schrag, associate education editor of the *Saturday Review* for his article, "Who Invented the Crisis in Education?" which had appeared in the *Journal's* spring issue.[107]

"The university has never been as important, as much in demand, as much in the news as it is now," wrote Schrag in an article which seemed to indicate that colleges and universities were themselves in large measure to blame for the so-called crises in education. "In the last decade the public was sold on the significance of higher education, on the need for more money, and even—for America—on the revolutionary idea that college professors have something to say to which other people might profitably listen. At the same time, it was sometimes oversold, missold, or misinterpreted. In a generation, the campus was turned, in the press and the public mind, from a place of pleasant quaintness to one of tremendous technological, economic, and social power. . . .

"The very success of our enterprise is its greatest problem. We have made the institution of higher education national, public, and prestigious. Now we have to find a way to keep the prestige—the publicness—from gobbling the institution up. I am not merely referring to the effects of large scale government research on a curriculum or on academic independence, but also of the public demand for a *quid pro quo* from institutions, however small, which have done their best to become visible, to attract attention, to be important. . . .

"These are signs," Schrag concluded, "that for all institutions some of the enchantment about higher education may be wearing off. I have recently been told by several people that the major corporate interest is shifting from higher education to urban problems, and that is where corporate funds are likely to go. Nonetheless, Americans have too much invested economically, psychologically, and socially in the success of higher education to let any viable college to flounder. It will henceforth be relatively easy to operate an institution that says 'yes'. It will be far more difficult to protect those elements which say 'no', and unless there are institutional voices willing and able to say 'no', there is no point in public relations or in independent higher education."[108]

In an article titled "Crisis—Academic and National," the *Journal* presented the views of J. William Fulbright, then a U.S. Senator and former president of the University of Arkansas. He expressed concern that an increasing number of universities were providing the know-how for strengthening the nation's military-industrial complex.

"The bonds between the government and the universities are no more the results of a conspiracy than those between government and business," Fulbright wrote. "They are the arrangement of convenience, providing the government with politically usable knowledge and the universities with badly needed funds. Most of these funds go to large institutions which need them less than some smaller and less well-known ones, but they do on the whole make a contribution to higher learning, a contribution, however, which is purchased at a high price.

"That price is the surrender of independence, the neglect of teaching, and the distortion of scholarship. A university which has become accustomed to the inflow of government contract funds is likely to emphasize activities which will attract those funds. . . .

"Among the baneful effects of the government-university contract system the most damaging and corrupting are the neglect of the university's most important purpose, which is the education of its students, and taking into the government camp of scholars, especially those in the social sciences, who ought to be acting as responsible and independent critics of their government's policies. The corrupting process is a subtle one: No one needs to censor, threaten, or give orders to contract scholars; without a word of warning or advice being uttered, it is simply understood that lucrative controls are awarded not to those who question their government's policies but to those who provide the government with the tools and techniques it desires. . . .

"When the university turns away from its central purpose and makes itself an appendage to the government, concerning itself with techniques rather than purposes, with expedients rather than ideals, dispensing conventional orthodoxy rather than new ideas, it is not only failing to meet its responsibilities to its students, it is betraying a public trust."[109]

In an article called "Unified Strategy and Command," Robert A. Kidera, vice president for university relations and development at Fordham University, said that the management concept growing out of the Greenbrier Conference of 1958 was no longer adequate.

"The old 'Greenbrier' concept of an 'administrative coordinator' of 'functions' who keeps peace among semiautonomous offices without the responsibility for initiating programs and appointing personnel, must," Kidera wrote, "be replaced by the idea of a strong, top-level administrator, functioning both as a staff and a line officer to the president. This administrator must have full responsibility for planning the strategy of the total university effort at mobilizing support, and for recruiting staff and allocating resources to carry out the university program in the alumni relations, public relations, and fund-raising areas.

"If they are to achieve the massive accumulative impact needed, our universities can no longer tolerate the situation where the dean, recruiting new faculty, extols the stability and high stature of the institution, while the president is signing panicky fund-raising letters for the alumni that predict that the institution may close unless support is forthcoming; nor can the student recruitment literature extol the new freedom given students while the alumni magazine of the same institution boasts of the strict regimentation which has been a tradition at its institution. Nor can any university afford the luxury of an appeal fund which is made prematurely, before the atmosphere of understanding has been generated or the involvement of prospects has created the enthusiasm and dedication required.

"The time has come to recognize that each college and university requires a highly skilled administrator, experienced in communications and human persuasion, who can advise the president and participate with him and the other chief officers in the development and formation of all university-wide policy. As a staff officer to the president, he represents the interest of the public, and especially the principal outside constituencies of the university. He will have much to contribute to the reshaping of the institution as it passes in transition to its new, bolder role in tomorrow's society.

"At the same time, this administrator functions as a line officer for a major area of the university. He is the major planner of the strategy which creates, as well as unifies, programs and activities in alumni relations, public relations, and fund raising, and supervises all activities in those areas. This means that he recruits personnel, approves budgets and programs, and reviews the effectiveness of all activities. . . . It is my contention that this lack of unified strategy is the missing ingredient in our university advancement programs today. It is this weakness—resulting in confusion and conflict—which we can no longer tolerate."[110]

The *Journal's* spring issue contained a segment of the managment study which ACPRA in 1965 had commissioned Charles Newton, assistant to the president at California Institute of Technology, to make with support from the Esso Education Foundation. Newton first mailed a questionnaire to 1,200 colleges and universities early in 1966. After returns had been analyzed a second questionnaire was sent to 405. Further screening reduced the number of respondents to 105, representing state and private universities and private coeducational, men's and women's colleges.[111]

Profusely illustrated with charts, the segment appearing in the *Journal* sought to answer seventeen questions related to gifts from living donors, such as "What amount of gifts should we be getting?" "How much should our college spend on advancement?" "What should it cost to raise money, in cents-per-dollar gift?" "If we spend more on advancement, will we get more gifts?" "How often should a president go out and ask for money?" "How important are alumni gifts in the total gift picture?" "What is the per capita cost of keeping contact with alumni?" and "What salary should we pay a top advancement executive?"

Using averages for the three years 1962-63, 1964-65, and 1965-66, Newton was able to answer most questions with definite figures compiled in charts. Although gifts received by the 105 institutions had ranged from $100,000 to $10 million, the median lay between $500,000 and $1 million because most gifts received by forty institutions did not exceed $500,000. Twelve institutions were spending more than fifty cents for each dollar raised and two of these were spending almost as much as they got back. For the whole sample, however, the average was seventeen cents per dollar. The statistics revealed that the institutions with the largest advancement budgets were likely to receive the largest amount in gifts and that the cost per gift usually went down as the amount in gifts went up.

Presidents in the above-median-gift group were found to be making at least one solicitation call a month and many were making more than ten such calls. On the other hand, nearly twenty percent of the presidents in the below-median-gift group reported that they made no calls. Newton discovered no correlation between frequency of staff solicitation and volume of gifts but did learn that in twenty-six out of twenty-eight cases where gifts of $500,000 or more had been secured from living alumni, the solicitations had been made by personnel other than those from the alumni office. At the same time the study enabled Newton to report that "as schools become more successful in fund raising and get larger amounts, the most responsive group they find are their own alumni." Per capita cost of keeping contact with alumni, Newton found, ran between $1 and $2 a year for the big universitiies and nearly $4 a year for the colleges.

Four of Newton's charts showed that high advancement budgets correlated with high gift results. Other statistics showed that the percentage of the educational and general budget spent on advancement had been reduced in all types of institutions except men's colleges between 1964 and 1966 and that, according to the annual CFAE report, gifts to all institutions had dropped 1.2 percent during the same period. "There may be an obvious lesson here and maybe not," Newton commented.

The overall median salary for the top advancement executive in 1964-65, Newton had learned, was around $15,000. More important, he said, a fairly simple yardstick had been found. "The top executive's salary is determined by the number of professsional people working under him, especially in the schools with staffs of five or more." The coordinator of advancement activities with ten or more professionals under him in 1964-65 was likely to get over $20,000 while coordinators with five or fewer were earning from $10,000 to $15,000.

A further study on salaries and staff, this one covering 1967-68, was made before Newton's report was published. President-elect Parry Sorensen wrote it up for the *Journal* in a four-page summary of data secured from 378 institutions. Salaries for top advancement officers—those vice presidents or directors with at least three of the four advancement functions under their jurisdiction—had by then reached as high as $30,000 in seven institutions. The median for all these officers lay between $15,000 and $17,500. Although salaries for the chief fund-raising and public relations officers also ranged up to $30,000, the median for the former was between $12,500 and $15,000, while that for the latter was between $10,000 and $12,500. The median for chief alumni relations and chief publications officers was also between $10,000 and $12,500. The median salary for fund-raising staffers was between $10,000 and $12,500 while that for public relations, alumni relations, and publications staffers was between $7,500 and $10,000. Salaries for staffers ranged widely, however, from a low of under $5,000 in each category to a high of $25,000 for those in fund raising, $20,000 for those in public relations, $17,500 for those in alumni relations, and $15,000 for those in publications. Median staff sizes were found to vary from one or two in state colleges to thirteen or fourteen in private universities.[112]

Editor Breedin had established a section, "Surveys and Opinion," in the *Journal* as a means of relaying to Association members information about significant studies. One such survey by Robert Lee Hoskins, director of public relations at Alice Lloyd College, helped direct ACPRA's attention to junior colleges and their public relations needs. Hoskins had made a survey among junior colleges, now numbering more than 8‹0, and learned that "the public relations role [in these colleges] is being handled by everyone from president to student."[113]

Seventy-four percent of Hoskin's respondents indicated that they had someone in charge of information responsibilities but that "someone" included deans, department heads, presidential assistants, secretaries, and students.

Most of the two-year colleges tried to keep local newspapers informed but only twenty percent released information to newspapers outside their immediate locality and only half ever offered articles to educational periodicals. Television received virtually no attention from these colleges and only sixty percent said they prepared programs for radio.

Hoskins gave three reasons for the lack of public realtions activities among junior colleges—lack of staff, lack of funds, and the failure of many presidents to recognize the need for public relations and information programs. In addition to the attention ACPRA now began to give to junior colleges, the American Association of Junior Colleges shortly created a public relations arm with an ACPRA member as its director.

Another survey, this one by Marion Peavey, director of information services at Wofford College, reported that seventy-seven percent of private and thirty-three percent of state-supported schools were spending from $100 to $16,000 annually on advertising, mostly in newspapers. All state-supported schools which had no advertising budgets reported that state law prohibited advertising in any form. State-supported institutions which did advertise, however, spent more annually than private colleges, an average of $3,466 compared to $2,600. The primary purpose of advertising for all institutions was student recruitment. Although most of the respondents who used advertising believed that it was ineffective or of dubious value, they continued the practice because it "seemed the thing to do." "Educational advertising," commented one private university administrator, "is like a merry-go-round—everyone does it yet no one knows where or how to stop."[114]

The last of *Techniques'* six issues for 1967-68, that for July-August, was devoted entirely to television. Its six articles, collected from papers presented at district workshops during the year, became a primer for members on the subjects of commercial media, regional educational television, hard and soft news, written releases, regulation of cameras, and the results of polls made on station preferences and values of college television news.

One of the surveys, based on replies received from 461 members of ACPRA by David G. Jackson of New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, indicated that only 115 originated television news stories using their own staff and equipment. Most of these stories concentrated on general news and features, for the stations had indicated a desire to cover sports themselves. The average college news director estimated that seventeen percent of his time and nearly ten percent of his budget went into television news. Practically all effort was directed to commercial stations located within seventy-five miles. Only twenty institutions presented regularly scheduled news programs using their own personnel. Thirty-five, however, had staff members assigned primarily to the preparation of television news. Most colleges were pleased with their coverage, and a typical comment was: "TV news has no back pages and our stories don't get lost in the ads."

Although 346 college information offices responding originated no television news using their own staff and equipment, 251 believed such a procedure would be beneficial, and 109 were trying to develop television news capability within their organizations. Those giving little time to television news generally gave one or both of two reasons: television coverage was too superficial and preparation of television stories was too time-consuming and expensive.

Main joint effort by ACPRA and the American Alumni Council in 1967-68 related to the national conference they would hold together in July. At a May meeting the Joint Liaison Committee decided for practical reasons of space and problems of management to dissolve their joint lending library at the end of August. In making this decision, which called for each organization to furnish its own library services thereafter, the Liaison Committee agreed that library facilities should be a continuing subject for discussion. Both organizations were anticipating the possibility of occupying space in the building the American Council on Education expected to complete in 1970, and thereafter a joint library would again be feasible.[115]

ACPRA and AAC coordinators chose "Communica '68" as the theme for the 1968 joint conference held in Miami Beach July 14-18 with the Deauville Hotel as headquarters. Although they decided not to hold a School of Public Relations, similar to the one sponsored by ACPRA since 1965, the "new look" sessions and National Honors Competition were featured. Thirty-one "new look" papers were presented and from these the national office gleaned material for its fifth volume of case studies published in 1969.

Twenty-one of the seventy-eight entries in the National Honors Competition received recognition, four with certificates of exceptional achievement and seventeen with certificates of special merit. Recipients of the former recognition, each of whom also received $500 incentive grants provided by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, were the University of Tennessee, Washington University, the University of Iowa, and Beloit College.

Of the 885 entries for Publications Leadership Awards, made separately from the National Honors Competition for the first time, sixty-four were accorded recognition. Two received incentive grants of $500 from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation and the others earned special citations. The grants were awarded to Hollins College for its total publications program and to Brigham Young University for publications program improvement.[116]

Because of the size of the conference, presidents of the two associations did not give their usual addresses. But in addition to taking a leading role in the television presentation mentioned earlier, Massey presented ACPRA's award for distinguished service to higher education to James F. Oates, chairman of Equitable Life Assurance Society, at the education and industry banquet. He also presented citations for extraordinary service to Fred C. Hess of Grinnell College, long-time Association leader and officer, and to Abel A. Hanson of Teachers College at Columbia University, for his work with the Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy.[117] These were the first such citations awarded. They replaced the outstanding achievement awards as a result of action taken by the Executive Committee the preceding September. At that same September meeting the committee had also established awards recognizing twenty-five years of service to higher education, but these were not presented until 1969-70.[118]

To express the appreciation they felt for the leadership of the quiet, unassuming Georgian who had been their president for the past year, ACPRA members unanimously passed the following resolution at the annual business meeting: "ACPRA gratefully acknowledges and duly recognizes the dedication, the enthusiasm, the good humor, the wise and forward-looking counsel, and the able leadership incorporated into this and previous years of service by its president for 1967-68. In a year when crisis on campus became commonplace, when more critical attention was focused on colleges and universities than ever before, when public relations assumed greater importance in higher education, ACPRA had at its helm an articulate spokesman, an exemplary practitioner, and a judicious executive. For its own good fortune in these regards, as well as for his labors in its behalf, ACPRA salutes and thanks its own Georgia Peach, Dyar Massey."

Massey then received a standing ovation as incoming President Michael Radock presented him with the past president's token of recognition, a dinosaur.[119]

Embarassed by the attention, Massey, who had stood tall in the fields of fund raising and public relations for two decades, could only repeat words he had spoken dozens of times before: "From ACPRA and its members I have received far more than I ever gave."

Just how tall the amiable Georgian stood in his fields of interest can be appreciated only when the records are carefully scrutinized. As early as 1956 he was advocating the coordination of alumni affairs, fund raising, and public relations, an action which would not be taken in most institutions until after ACPRA and AAC merged to form the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) in 1974. Although he never held the title of vice president himself, he advocated it for the coordinating officer and convinced many presidents of the wisdom of this choice. And as he stepped down from the presidency of ACPRA he assumed that of the Georgia Chapter of the National Society of Fund Raisers. Four years later he crowned his years of service in the Public Relations Society of America by serving as president of its Georgia Chapter.

For its annual awards banquet scheduled for March 13, 1973, the Association of Private Colleges and Universities of Georgia had planned to present Dyar "for service above and beyond the call of duty" a special citatiton which read in part: "One of the outstanding servants of higher education in this state has been Dyar Massey . . . who has always gone the extra mile to render the service that all his friends have come to identify with this man. . . . Dyar Massey has given generously of his time and energy to all the colleges of Georgia, through the Association of Private Colleges and Universities in Georgia and the numerous other organizations with which he has been associated. . . . Beyond the field of education he has been a committed Christian citizen, serving actively as a leader in his church, and in numerous organizations throughout his community."

The award was presented to Massey's family. Dyar, who had been in frail health much of his adult life without breathing this fact to his closest associates, had died at age fifty-six on March 8.[120]

Parry D. Sorensen, assistant to the president at the University of Utah, was introduced at the conference business meeting as the Association's president-elect. Other members of the new Executive Committee were Duane A. Dittman, St. Lawrence University, secretary; W. Robert Brossman, Colorado College; Patrick W. Hogan, Florida State University; James S. Triolo, Salk Institute; and Radock.

When ACPRA's Executive Committee held its first meeting in Dallas in July, 1967, it had set $232,500 as the budget for 1967-68. At the same time it raised the fee for additional member representatives from $35 to $42.[121]

When the committee met during the 1968 conference Executive Vice President John Leslie reported that income had already reached $246,411 while expenses had been kept to $160,865.

At least one Executive Committee member wondered whether Leslie didn't carry his frugality, now famous, to extremes occasionally. As several of the men flew from Washington to Miami, Leslie had announced that he had rented a car for the week and would take the group to the hotel from the airport. He made a call from the airport and informed his friends that a green station wagon, flying an American flag from its antenna, would be dispatched at once to take the men to his rental. The station wagon showed up an hour later with a driver who spoke only Spanish. Fortunately, James Triolo, a member of the group, communicated well with the driver, and the men were taken several miles into Miami to what appeared to be an automobile wrecking yard. The manager of the yard pointed out a fifteen-year-old car and told Leslie it was his. One of the back doors would not open and riders in the back seat could get in from one side only. When the men put their bags in the trunk, they noticed that there was no spare tire. The manager assured Leslie he would bring a spare if a flat occurred.

Leslie had seen an advertisement in Washington offering cars in Miami for $15 a week and had arranged to rent one with which to pick up guests at the airport. After a ride in his rented car, Leslie made arrangements to use the new Buick owned by Westley Rowland, immediate past president, to transport guests. The rented car was used to run a few blocks down the street to dinner a couple of times. Fortunately, there were no flat tires.[122]

With six weeks to go before the end of the fiscal year, it was evident to the Executive Committee that the Association would have a comfortable surplus. It consequently voted to transfer $25,000 to the reserve fund, thus raising it to $100,000. At the same time a tentative budget of $258,000 was set for 1968-69.[123]

When ACPRA's fifty-first year ended on August 31, Leslie was able to report that institutional membership had grown steadily since 1965, from 970 in that year to 1,146 in the current year. This figure did not include fifty-four educational associates—organizations interested in or related to higher education—or thirty-five subscribers, mostly college students anticipating careers in public relations and development. The number of individuals holding membership in the Association was now above 3,500.[124]

The Association's financial picture was even brighter. From $7,150 in 1963 its net worth had grown to $218,051. Income for the year ($311,160) had exceeded expenses ($249,492) by $61,668. Receipts from grants had totalled $28,840.[125] The famed Leslie frugality was paying off in a time of increasing national office activity. And the Association was in the strongest financial position in its history.

A New Challenge: The Restless Campus

Two pictures, one showing heavily armed students with bandoleers leaving a building they had occupied, the other a helicopter dropping tear gas on a university campus, became for millions the symbols for 1968-69. It was a year of discontent, conflict, and violence on many college and university campuses. The reservoir of good will which had grown up over the years was drained considerably as a result. Many citizens, including alumni, donors, and legislators, began to doubt the ability of institutions to govern themselves. In statehouses and in Congress punitive legislation was introduced and in some cases passed. Some of the best of the nation's educational leaders departed for other fields. Gift income, increasingly important to all educational institutions, dropped and the strength of future support was more and more in doubt.[126]

Against this backdrop, ACPRA, with Michael Radock of the University of Michigan as its president, endeavored to plan creative, decisive programs which could help meet the needs of the day.

Even as he was assuming the presidency months before the symbols of 1968-69 became firmly implanted in the public mind, Radock had warned that "Today's college campus is no longer protected by an 'ivory-covered academic curtain'." The biggest problem looming for colleges would be learning to accommodate to change, predicted Radock, whose twenty-five-year career had combined the academic, business, and professional fields of journalism, public relations, and development.

"Educational institutions which fail to adjust to changing conditions in society will face crisis after crisis and may have difficulty even surviving," he warned. "We cannot avoid the issues and causes which trouble our society and, at times, threaten to tear apart our world. Our colleges must help to find the answers to the problems of urban decay and the ghetto, water and air pollution, urban transportation, civil disobedience, racial tensions, old age, and rebellious youth. . . . From education comes the manpower, the ideas, the basic research, the innovation, the necessary heresies for a dynamic society. All this spells change and almost by definition change is unsettling, whether it is a new way of doing things, a new way of thinking, or a new demand upon resources."

Radock held that explaining the change occurring in colleges and universities was making the job of the educational public relations man not only stimulating, but vitally necessary to the strength of the institutions and their capacity to serve society.

"We're in the business," he said, "of trying to keep the fire going under the crucibile of change and yet preventing it from boiling over or being upset."[127]

Radock's philosophy was widely accepted by members of ACPRA. The Association moved to give special attention to programs designed to improve the professional competence of present members and assure professional training for individuals planning to enter the educational public relations field in the future. Increased effort was made to collect and distribute pertinent and reliable information of a professional nature in the field of educational public relations and development, to supplement regular conferences and workshops with a series of programs designed to increase professional competence at all levels of experience, and to make worthwhile additions to the literature of the field.

In accordance with the move to provide broader long-range planning for the Association, as authorized by the Board of Trustees the previous year, Radock named task forces on professional development, developing institutions and organizations, and administration of advancement programs headed, respectively by Clarence Whitefield of Duke University, Dyar Massey of Emory University, and W. Robert Brossman of Colorado College.[128]

The summer internship program planned the previous year had been well received but still lacked the outside financial support needed. The possibility of establishing an internship program for blacks desiring public relations and development positions had been discussed at the first meeting of the 1968-69 board, and this was one interest of the Task Force on Professional Advancement. Another objective was the development of ways to attract students and young adults to the field and improve the level of professional training generally. By February the Ford Foundation had funded an internship program for predominately black colleges and Radock was serving as chairman of a steering committee for the program.[129]

In appointing the Task Force on Developing Institutions, Radock recommended to the trustees that ACPRA "take the initiative in organizing a group of experienced public relations and development personnel who could form a nucleus of an Institutional Advancement Corps. This group of counselors would be available to consult with predominantly black colleges, with newly-organized community junior colleges, with colleges in foreign countries, or with administrators or staff members of other newly-developing educational institutions on problems of public relations and development."[130]

Because internal administrative relationships constantly seemed to be in a state of evolution, Brossman's group was charged with evaluating them and making recommendations. It was expected that any recommendations resulting would be implemented in 1970 or shortly thereafter.

At the same time the Committee on International Relations continued to supervise the translation of fifty selected case studies into Spanish for distribution in Latin American countries. This volume, *Casos y Experiences*, was published before the end of the fiscal year with the assistance of gifts from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation and ACPRA's Far West District. The committee also completed arrangements with the U. S. Information Service to translate Harold J. Seymour's *Design for Fund Raising* into Spanish for Latin American distribution.[131] Plans were made with several Latin American organizations to hold a series of seminars for rectors and business leaders to demonstrate the value of philanthropy and booster programs.[132]

The growing importance of ACPRA's work south of the border had led its trustees in recent years to consider the feasibility of holding an annual conference in Mexico City, possibly in 1973. Although a poll of member representatives had resulted in a three-to-one vote in favor of a Mexico City conference, the board finally decided in February, 1969, "that a conference out of the United States could not be justified at this time."[133]

ACPRA's concern with management received additional emphasis when data compiled by Executive Vice President John Leslie during a three-year study was published under the title *Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management*. This study, made possible by a grant of $43,000 received from the Esso Foundation in 1967, presented innumerable suggestions for effective management of institutional advancement programs and supplementary charts. Recognizing the value of data contained in the Leslie work, the Association's Board of Trustees decided to update the information annually. Annette L. Bacon of California Institute of Technology, who had assisted in the initial statistical analysis, was retained on a part-time basis to handle the continuing computations.[134]

The three-year plan for an expanded program of conferences, institutes, and workshops was now in its second year. In October, 1968, the first National Publications Institute was held at the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Georgia. Emphasizing guidelines for the management of a total publications program and methods for the most efficient use of the publications dollar, the week-end institute drew fifty-four registrants from twenty-two states. Its success led the Association to schedule a second institute held at the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Notre Dame the following July in connection with the third annual Summer Academy. The academy program, growing annually in popularity, was thus expanded into a four-course offering extending over two weeks. The first was devoted to a basic survey and an advanced seminar in educational public relations and development, while the second included a course in tax aspects of philanthropic giving and publications. The course in tax aspects was later transferred to Chicago from Notre Dame.[135]

In this second year of the three-year program, the national office assisted with workshops held in connection with eight of the nine annual district meetings. Seven were on the use of electronic data processing in advancement programs and the eighth was on television techniques, the subject used in most districts the previous year. By this time the district workshops had become so popular that the Board of Trustees began planning for two in each district in 1969-70, one on special events for public relations officers, the other on foundation relations for development officers. To assist the districts further the Association in 1968-69 again held two one-day planning sessions for district officers and their associates, one in Denver and the other in Washington.[136]

For several years ACPRA had been looking forward to becoming a tenant in the multimillion dollar National Center for Higher Education being erected at One Dupont Circle, Washington, by ACE. As it became likely that the Center would be ready for occupancy by the autumn of 1969, the Board of Trustees voted to establish a Research-Reference Center when the new headquarters became available. Expected to develop into one of the Association's most important services for member institutions, the center was to be the storehouse of information on everything relevant in the areas of college public relations and development. Individuals would be expected to share their insights and accomplishments with the center, which in turn would provide appropriate information for inquiring institutions.

The Research-Reference Center, as planned, would be charged with: (1) conducting surveys and circulating findings in appropriate areas of interest; (2) maintaining a close liaison with the research departments of all other organizations in higher education, fund raising, public relations, publications, and communications, and making important findings available to ACPRA members; (3) developing an efficient and economical means of information storage and retrieval; and (4) counseling other members of the Association's professional staff on programs, publications, and information possibilities and receiving, in turn, guidance for research projects. Products of research efforts, plans indicated, would be made available to the entire membership through one of the Association's periodicals.[137]

ACPRA gave increased time to cooperative efforts with other organizations in 1968-69, that with the AAC regarded as most important because of the joint national conference scheduled for New York City in July. In an August meeting William Armstrong, chairman of AAC's board, indicated to President Radock that AAC believed ACPRA had pushed too hard on various aspects of cooperative efforts, including the joint reference library. It was agreed, however, that AAC and ACPRA should hold side-by-side conferences in Washington in 1971 following separate conferences in 1970. ACPRA's trustees later voted "to cooperate with AAC on joint conferences, district alignments, special workshops and institutes, and in any other activities where duplication of effort might be avoided by joint offerings and closer communication between the two organizations on both district and national levels."[138]

Meanwhile, a survey by Ruth Prescott, director of information services at Grinnell College, indicated that the duplication in institutional memberships between AAC and ACPRA had grown from 722 in 1965 to 882 in 1969. At the same time the total number of individuals holding membership in both organizations had jumped from 751 in 1965 to 976 in 1969.[139] These duplications, said ACPRA, called for the closest possible cooperation between the two organizations with efforts made to avoid programs duplicating services.

Announcement that ACPRA would henceforth be associated with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), a national network of nineteen clearinghouses sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education, was made in April, 1969. This network collected, abstracted, and announced research and research-related documents which would now be made available to ACPRA members on request. Association members in turn would be expected to submit copies of papers, speeches, conference proceedings, and research materials to one or more of the ERIC clearinghouses.[140]

In February, 1969, the Board of Trustees voted to endorse and co-sponsor with the Educational Facilities Laboratories a major national conference called "Campus in the City." The conference, concentrating on the planning and designing of campuses for urban colleges and universities, was set for 1970. At the same meeting, President Radock announced that he had offered ACPRA's cooperation to AP whose News Enterprise Committee had invited college and university presidents to submit ideas of educational projects not being covered in the news media.[141]

Problems related to taxation continued to bother ACPRA members in 1968-69, as proposed revisions in laws being considered in Congress promised to remove or limit income tax deductions for charitable purposes. T. Willard Hunter's book, *The Tax Climate for Philanthropy* was published and copies distributed to some 3,000 individuals and organizations. In addition the Association's COTP, now headed by Edward J. Boling of the University of Tennessee, reviewed tax reform proposals in the February issue of the *Newsletter* and in August produced a special six-page tax issue of that publication. This, the national office announced, was the first of a series of mailings it planned to make in relation to tax legislation.[142] Because of the significance of proposed legislation to higher education in terms of private-gift support, it also planned to hold a two-day briefing conference in Washington within sixty days after the signing of the bill ultimately hammered out.[143]

Thus tax legislation was much on the minds of college advancement officers. Robert Kidera of Fordham University, general chairman for the national conference held jointly by ACPRA and AAC, engaged two experts at the last minute to summarize and explain tax reform legislation.[144] Before the conference ended the conferees had acted to send "to appropriate persons in Congress a resolution stating the position of ACPRA and AAC on pending tax reform."

The impact of campus unrest on fund raising had also become such a concern of ACPRA during 1968-69 that a survey of representative colleges, universities, and fund-raising firms was made in March and reported in the April issue of the *Newsletter*. Although approximately twenty percent of the colleges reported that gift income had dropped off, and in some cases applications for admissions, too, the survey concluded that "campus unrest and its effect on financial support defies precise quantitative analysis . . . but should the trend deepen, voluntary financial support will drop dramatically."

A large problem emphasized by the survey concerned "the never-to-be-recouped loss of productive staff time spent in working on the disorders." "We did nothing for five weeks but put out fires," one development officer reported. "It will take us two or three times those five weeks just to recover." Letters and verbal complaints concerning the handling of student unrest had been received by most institutions. Some even reported cancellation of their telephone solicitations "because so many prospective donors harangued the solicitors." Another concern related to the changing of wills. More than half of the institutions reported evidence of persons taking such action.

Summarizing the survey findings were the following comments: "There will be legislative repercussions—tougher legislation, lower appropriations, or both; the broad climate for college fund raising is worsening, compounded by movement of foundation and corporate donors toward urban project support; accumulating pressures will force weak administrations out; only decisive but reasonable action can counter student elements concerned more with disruption than principle."

Resumed after a one-year lapse, ACPRA's School for Administrators drew a record enrollment of 663. Tax questions and student unrest received major attention for two days immediately prior to the Association's national conference held with the AAC in New York City July 21-24. With "The Restless Campus: Search for Understanding and Support" as its theme the conference drew 1,660 conferees from the two organizations.

In announcing the theme for the conference, Kidera had said, "Traditionally, the American college campus has been the scene of intellectual ferment and social change. Today, the scope and spirit of that change challenges the very nature and life of our academic institutions. Educational administrators, especially those responsible for developing public understanding and support, must anticipate the effects of these changes upon their individual institutions and upon their particular roles within the colleges and universities. The program will be designed to assist [conferees] to understand more fully the nature of these changes and the demands placed upon their work."[145]

President Morris B. Abram of Brandeis University was the keynote speaker at the conference. His address, along with the addresses of other major speakers at four general sessions, was later published in *College and University Journal*.

After reminding his audience that Plato more than two thousand years earlier had complained that "the students are filled with lawlessness" and that the current student rebellion was world-wide, Abram called for more candor in communication among students, faculty, and administration.

"But," he said, "communication alone will not provide the solution to our problems. Communicate means to 'impart, pass on, transmit' and I think that on our campuses today there is so much distrust and suspicion that most imparting, passing on, and transmitting is rendered sterile. We talk a great deal to each other, and we have many additional channels through which to communicate. But while there is an impressive amount of good phrasing, there is precious little good faith. . . .

"We must face the situation squarely and honestly. Despite improvement in communications, the students feel threatened by us and we feel threatened by the students. It is not because one or the other is evil . . . but because the 1960s would inevitably try the compatibility (to say nothing of the souls) of any two or three generations living together on the planet. . . . In my judgment, under these difficult circumstances, we must make a more profound art of communication. We just see the problem in two major parts; one, the problem of the issues, and two, the problem of human behavior and human relationships. . . . I think the element of individuality has been overlooked on the restless campus of the past several years, and I can think of no sadder commentary on the entire situation than this. . . .

"The young people of this generation are challenging us to accept new and better goals—and they are right," Abram concluded. "We have the duty and responsibility to acknowledge the acceptable parts of the profound social movement taking place today. And we also have the responsibility to reject the parts that are simply incompatible with the lives of free men."[146]

Earlier in the year, Representative William E. Brock III of Tennessee had headed a group of twenty-two Congressmen who had made an unofficial, unpublicized tour to talk to students in more than fifty public, private, and denominational institutions. The group's objective was to determine the factors involved in student unrest.

"Despite the variety," Brock told the ACPRA and AAC conferees in an address on "Gut Issues of Campus Unrest," "we were able to recognize a number of basic factors which contributed to student unrest. When they were strongly evident, chaos had usually occurred. Where these factors had been recognized in time, and competent efforts made to cope with them, both the risk and the incidence of violent disruption were substantially diminished."

Brock said that, surprisingly, those problems with the greatest potential danger were internal rather than external in nature, a fact which had not been recognized in most media coverage of campus unrest.

"Such people [media representatives]," Brock declared, "usually blamed student disturbances solely on the Vietnam War, racial injustice, and other problems of society at large. While these things definitely played a part in cresting ferment on campus, we were told almost everywhere we went—by student radicals as well as student moderates—that even if the Vietnam War were settled tomorrow, the turmoil on campus would continue, largely unabated. To them, Vietnam was *not* the issue. . . . The real burning student grievances—potent complaints that could mobilize large numbers of students who were not necessarily political activists or militant ideologues—struck much closer home. The students' vague, undefined disenchantment with adult society and the outside world ususally paled by comparison to dissatisfaction with specific campus conditions. Proof of this was provided by our encounters with student radicals on a number of campuses who frankly admitted that as long as their university's administration and faculty continued to maintain good relations with the student body, there was little chance of 'radicalizing' any substantial group of students on purely external political issues."

Brock said that his group had visited some insitutions where the political leanings of the student body were more conservative than the norm, yet found that poor student-faculty and student-administration relations were precipitating confrontation.

"It appears that, as in politics," Brock commented, "the real 'gut' issues are those which most directly and personally affect the individual. . . . The majority of us [members of the Brock group] remain convinced that it will be internal structure and reform, or the lack of it, which will decide the future of our universities."[147]

Outside the general sessions, most of the meat of the conference came from twelve "new look" sessions during which forty-eight papers on new approaches to campus problems were presented by members of ACPRA and AAC. Most of these papers were then published in *Techniques* during 1969-70.[148]

ACPRA's award for distinguished service to higher education for 1969 was presented to Wayne Morse. His citation said, in part, that Morse "perhaps as much as any other man in America today has left his imprint on the nation's educational program. From legislation benefiting the preschool child to that broadening the opportunities for the the predoctoral fellow, his role has been a central one in education's great recent advances, particularly in acceptance of federal responsibility for financing an overburdened system."

The Association also presented presidential citations to George J. Cooke, Jr., of the AAC for "empitomizing the committed, effective, and productive worker in the cause of education," and to Russell J. Thackrey of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges not only as dean of higher education's spokesmen in the nation's capital, but also because "he has helped shape in no small way the federal government's involvement in higher education."[149]

In the National Honors Competition, now a traditional part of the annual national conference, citations of exceptional achievement, along with $500 awards provided by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, went to the University of California for program management, to Marquette University for financial support, and to Cornell University and St. Leo College for information projects. Seventeen institutions received certificates of special merit.

The Sears, Roebuck Foundation also provided $500 awards for winners in the competition for Publications Leadership Awards. A record 1,185 entries had been received in this competition and the judges gave the top awards to Cornell for its total publications program and to Centre College of Kentucky for publications program improvement. Seventy-four institutions received special citations.[150]

While meeting during the national conference in New York, the Board of Trustees implemented a bylaw change voted by the membership a few weeks earlier. They increased the number of trustees-at-large from three to six, thus making the total number of trustees for 1969-70 thirty-one.[151]

Although the Executive Committee had earlier selected Minneapolis as the site for the 1972 conference and San Francisco and Atlanta tentatively as sites for the 1973 and 1974 conferences, the trustees now asked the Executive Committee to study the feasibility of holding national conferences biennially, hopefully in cooperation with the AAC. A special membership category of educational associates had been established in 1960 and the trustees now voted to welcome independent secondary schools in this category. Nonprofit secondary schools accredited by the appropriate recognized body would be able to affiliate with ACPRA for an annual fee of $100. The fee for other educational associates, most of them national organizations with special interest in higher education, continued at $150.[152]

In line with the changing times, ACPRA decided to get a new logo for its printed materials to replace the oval with script letters used since 1957. In New York the trustees approved a crisp, san serif design created by John Furlow of Duke University and, starting in November, 1969, the Association used this symbol until its merger with the AAC in 1974. At this same meeting President Radock suggested that the role of the ACPRA president be studied and the result was a decision two years later to have the chief executive officer on the national office staff carry the title of president, while the top elected officer would be designated as chairman of the Board of Trustees.[153]

The reports on both membership and finances made in New York presaged a banner year in these areas and when the year closed on August 31 it had been even better than anticipated. The number of institutions holding membership had reached an even 1,200, although the number of member representatives had not reached the 3,500 of the year before.[154] On a budget of $259,500 income had reached $399,104, while expenses were only $325,764. Net worth of the Association had grown from $218,051 to $294,481. The Finance Committee had decided in April that the financial reserve should eventually equal one year's operating budget and it now stood at $108,506. Gifts and grants for the year had exceeded $18,000, including $7,500 from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation for the National Honors Competition and $5,000 from the United States Steel Foundation for the Summer Academy. More than $130,000 of the Association's expenses had gone for publications, workshops, institutes, and the annual conference.[155] Announcement was made that the Sears, Roebuck grant for the Honors Competition was being terminated but that the foundation would provide $12,000 to help the Association produce the case studies of the last five years in a ring-bound book.[156]

The Executive Committee set $302,500 as the budget for 1969-70. This figure would enable the national office to add two secretaries and an additional professional to make possible improved quality as well as quantity in the expanding program of services. The additional professional would be Cletis Pride, news director at Duke University, who would become director of the new Research-Reference Center in January, 1970.[157]

On the day the national conference ended, the Executive Committee for 1969-70 named as president-elect Duane A. Dittman, vice president for institutional resources at St. Lawrence University and the Association's secretary for the past year. Gordon B. Strayer, director of public information and university relations at the University of Iowa, was elected secretary and Parry D. Sorensen, executive assistant to the president at the University of Utah, was advanced automatically to the office of president. Others elected to serve on the Executive Committee along with the officers and past President Radock were Edward J. Boling, University of Tennessee; Roland C. Matthies, Wittenberg University; and Clarence Whitefield, Duke University.[158]

ACPRA's *College and University Journal* contained in 1968-69 a larger than usual number of articles helpful to presidents, deans, and business officers as well as to those men and women charged with public relations and development. Perhaps the strongest article of the year was "Campus Leadership 1968: a Critique," the lead article in the *Journal's* autumn issue. Written by Richard W. Smith, first editor of both *College and University Journal* and *Education Abstracts* and now director of public relations for the James W. Rouse Company of Baltimore, it suggested that campus leaders had been on a treadmill for the past twenty years—too caught up in fund raising, image creating, construction needs, and record enrollments to consider direction. It gained for Smith ACPRA's 1969 Distinguished Article Award of $500.[159]

"For twenty-five years American higher education has been so prosperous that it has been able to do without educational philosophers," Smith wrote. "The system has substituted growth for self-evaluation, fund raising for contemplation, and innovation for theory. Self-criticism within the establishment has almost ceased to exist, and the administrators bury themselves deeper and deeper in the numbers game where the reading is very pleasant indeed. The hard measure of success—in terms of students in class, degrees issued, buildings built, grants received, articles published, gifts from alumni or any other statistical mark—all indicate that the state of health of American higher education could never be better."

Smith saw problems ahead for higher education if colleges and universities continued "to move ahead without any underpinning of educational or philosophical theory." Among the problems looming, in his opinion, were those resulting from "the rapid growth of marginal community colleges," "the steady expansion of contract research in the universities," "the constant erosion of the curriculum and the willingness of the higher education institutions to take on any assignment," "the tendency to emphasize occupationally-oriented programs rather than mind-stretching experience," the generation gap, the "guerilla warfare four-year colleges have fought with community colleges," and "the lack of candor in presenting facts about colleges and universities."

"There is often a wide divergence between the college community's official public stance and what is actually happening on the campus," Smith declared. "It is not that so many blatant misstatements of fact are made, it is that the institutions reserve for themselves the right to make all of the interpretations of those facts. . . . Much of the difficulty which the colleges are having is because they have a real credibility gap between what they say they are doing and what the students see. . . . While the colleges have been able to get along quite well over the past few years without any overriding educational philosophy, there is some indication that the students feel their loss quite deeply. . . .

"The colleges could solve their problem by redefining their goals and by reducing their attempts to do everything for everybody. They could improve the quality of their student bodies by improving standards and by the elimination of the marginal and 'gut' courses which are so much a part of many curriculums. They could assist the public by actually giving their accreditation agencies permission to demand a reasonable level of performance. . . .

"However, as long as colleges and universities continue to move forward without any underpinning of educational and philosophical theory, they are likely to continue their present supermarket course of attempting to be all things to all people. And, since it seems logical to assume that no institution can do equally well in everything it attempts, the colleges are certain to come under critical fire in those areas where they are not doing a good job. Retrenchment might be the better part of valor. Reassessment of goals is long overdue. Considerable self-criticism is in order.

"It is reasonable to expect," Smith concluded, "that the colleges themselves might enjoy a respite from the continued whirl of fund raising and expansion in which they have been immersed for two decades. . . . A decade ago more dollars may have seemed like the only possible answer for survival but, today, this is not the case except for a few hundred of the marginal small colleges. And, even at these colleges now facing extinction, the dollar crises would be much relieved if the direction of higher education were altered. Today, the long-range solutions to the problems of higher education are not necessarily in the hands of the fund raisers and developers. It is time for the colleges themselves to go back to class and find some answers from within."[160]

Television's impact on the day's college generation was explored by an old friend of ACPRA, S. I. Hayakawa, famed semanticist now president of San Francisco State College, in the Winter, 1969, issue of the *Journal*.

Describing television as a powerful sorcerer, Hayakawa wrote: "In order to describe what is going on today, let me suggest an analogy. Suppose from the time that your children are old enough to sit up and understand words and pictures, they are snatched away from you by this sorcerer for three or four hours a day. This sorcerer is a storyteller and a spinner of dreams. He plays enchanting music; he is an unfailingly entertaining companion. He makes the children laugh; he teaches them jingles to sing; he is constantly suggesting good things to eat and wonderful toys for their parents to buy them. Day after day, month after month, year after year, children for a few hours a day live in the wonderful world created by the sorcerer—a world of laughter and music and adventure and incredible goings on, sometimes frightening, often fun, and always entrancing.

"The children grow older, still under the daily spell of the sorcerer. Parents and relatives and teachers may talk to them, but the children find them sometimes censorious, often dull. But the sorcerer is always fascinating so that they sit there and sit there as if drugged, absorbing messages that parents did not originate and often do not even know about. For one-fourth or more of their waking hours from infancy onward, they live in a semantic environment their parents did not create and make no attempt to control."

Hayakawa criticized television for glorifying violence, encouraging impulsive and thoughtless buying, discouraging thrift, failing to teach democratic processes, and making "all happiness, all significance, all values that human beings strive for purchasable commodities."

"The child who watches television for four hours daily between the ages of three and eighteen spends something like 22,000 hours in passive contemplation of the screen—hours stolen from the time needed to learn to relate to siblings, playmates, parents, grandparents, or strangers. Is there any connection between this fact and the sudden appearance in the past few years of an enormous number of young people from educated and middle-class families who find it difficult or impossible to relate to anybody—and therefore drop out? . . .

"Television says nothing about the hard work, the years of study, the patient postponement of gratification, that are necessary to pay for the beautiful and expensive way of life advertised in the commercials. It says that material possessions are everything: that this headache remedy, this luxurious carpeting, this new model automobile, will bring you charm, popularity, sexual fulfillment, domestic tranquility, and the envy and respect of your neighbors."

Hayakawa questioned claims that militant young people were eager for social change because they had lost faith in "the slow processes of democratic discussion and decision making."

"It is my impression," he declared, "that militant young people, far from being 'disillusioned' with democratic processes, are totally unacquainted with them, since they are rarely shown on television. . . . If young people did not learn of the complexities of the democratic process from their years of viewing television, what did they learn? They learned that social problems are never complicated; they are simply the conflicts between good guys and bad guys. Bad guys can never be reasoned with—you can only shoot it out with them. If the bad guys confront you with superior force, you can lay your body on the line and go down fighting."

Hayakawa concluded with a call for careful research by colleges and organizations other than advertising agencies regarding the effects of television on family communication. "The trouble is," he said, "that what research there is on the effects of television is almost entirely limited to that by advertising agencies on the effectiveness of their campaigns. Inquiries into the overall effects of television—on politics, on public opinion and decision making, on the life styles of young people and the psychic lives of young children—are only beginning. This is therefore not a presentation of conclusions but a request that we begin making inquiries. What *are* the relations between mass media and family communications? How do we begin answering such questions?"[161]

As the year wore on the *Journal* gave increasing attention to campus crises. Writing on "Front and Center in the Revolution," Loren Hickerson, executive director of the University of Iowa Alumni Association and a past president of the AAC, emphasized that the college public relations director needed "to grasp the enormous significance of his role."

"He is at the vortex of the social revolution," declared Hickerson, who had been one of the designers of the Greenbrier Conference sponsored by ACPRA and AAC in 1958. "He is in the front ranks of the most gargantuan public relations assignment in history. His options are clear: surrender, or lead the attack upon social disorder and unreason—not just on campus, but in the whole society.

"When I speak of broader perspective as a vital touchstone of campus public relations in this new age, I think I speak knowingly. It is a quality which students lack, as well as faculty and most administrators. Of all of these, and for all of these, the public relations practitioner must possess it and reflect it and act in the light of it. . . .

"Each side [students and administration] reflects unilateral views," he commented. "The goal [of public relations] is to bring perspective to widely divergent and unilateral views—not just to one point of view but to any and all points of view which may crop up between the extremes. . . .

"Somehow, after nearly 200 years of nationhood, we have to rediscover how to live together in this historic land of ours, in peace and harmony and to our mutual advantage as free citizens. This is the transcendent public relations challenge of the age.

"Let us not kid ourselves that the task can be assigned to news bureaus and commissions of government, at any level. The prosperity of America in this new age is the business of every agent and agency in the American establishment. It is the greatest single obligation of your institutions and mine. As public relations practitioners, at whatever steps on the ladders of ultimate responsibility and authority, it is nonetheless your personal business, and mine."[162]

Theodore Sorensen, long-time aide and confident of President John F. Kennedy, enumerated succinctly "Dangers Facing the University" in the same issue of the *Journal*.

"The university," he said, "is endangered by those members of the student body whose only consistent program is to wreck a virtually defenseless institution through violence, coercion, threats, and arbitrary interference with the rights of other students.

"It is endangered by those members of the faculty who place their passion for popularity among the students and their desire to be in the *avante garde* ahead of their obligation to the university's integrity and future.

"It is endangered by those administrators whose refusal to heed the peaceful protests, to negotiate just grievances, to listen to reason, or to accept change, thereby makes violence predictable, however unjustifiable.

"It is endangered by those trustees who seek to suppress dissent and nonconformity on the campus, who refuse to grant students any voice in their own affairs and who, thereby, invite an escalation of protest tactics and an enlargement of the protesting group.

"It is endangered by those public officials, law enforcement officers, and politicians who respond to popular dismay over student behavior by unleashing a host of harsh measures and methods, ranging from swinging billy clubs to cutting financial aid; methods which do not discriminate between just and unjust student objectives, between peaceful and violent demonstrators or between those who are counseling outrages against the university and those who are protesting outrages by the university.

"The university is endangered, finally, by those members of the general public whose reaction to continued disorder is all too likely to be one of repression instead of reform, thereby increasing the power and popularity of those already committed, even in the absence of disorder, to cutting back on university funds and freedom, to holding back the rights of the young and the black, and to boosting the very causes of militarism, racism, and bossism that most protestors struggle to end."[163]

Of the reports carried in the *Journal's* "Survey and Opinion" section in 1968-69, two were of special interest to readers,—one because it revealed that college news writers were still falling short in all too many cases, the other because it indicated that the development officer had emerged as a chief policy officer, particularly in institutions where he held vice presidential status.

Through questionnaires answered by education editors of eighty-two newspapers published across the country, Andrew A. DeToma, news director at Smith College, learned that complaints concerning releases had changed little since they were last aired by Benjamin Fine of the New York *Times* some fifteen year earlier. Respondents indicated that colleges were continuing to employ in too many cases young and inexperienced individuals to handle their news, and that releases were too often biased and verbose, of little news value, lacking in clarity, unappealing in style. The defects of stories in many cases resulted in poor rather than good public relations with editors and led DeToma to conclude that the contents and use of press releases had to be reevaluated.

"Their journalistic quality must be upgraded," he wrote. "They must be more concise. Their news value must be more carefully considered. The number and length of those sent out must be carefully considered and probably considerably reduced. The contents must be more carefully tailored for their potential use. . . . More information should be going to the press about student-faculty and student-administration relationships and the actual workings of the institutions. Potentially controversial matters should not be ignored by the institutions until a surprise story appears in the press. . . . Although the press is twice as likely to be concerned about events on the campus in a crisis situation, it is seeking information on the institutions even under normal conditions."[164]

The judgment concerning development officers was made by Carl M. Halvarson, director of planning at King College of Bristol, Tennessee, on the basis of data obtained from ninety-nine ACPRA members with responsibilities in the development area.

All responding development directors in institutions with enrollments between 5,000 and 10,000 were found to be serving as line *and* staff officers and responsible only to their presidents, were helping shape the internal administrative and academic policies of their institutions, and were planning development programs within the educational-academic context of the institutions. When the directors of institutions of all sizes were lumped together, the percentage found to be serving in these three areas of activity stood at eighty-nine, seventy, and eighty-one, respectively. Eighty percent of all directors were found to be serving on their president's administrative council, while eighty-one percent were engaging in long-range planning with outside consultants in education and/or fund raising, and the same percentage were interpreting development or advancement concepts and programs to faculty and staff. Seventy-one percent were sharing in the major policy making decisions at their institutions. Fund raising was found to be the external thrust of the chief development officer seventy-six percent of the time. At the other extreme, only thirteen percent were teaching one or more courses, fourteen percent were mediating administration-faculty conflicts and attending meetings of the dean's academic council, and nine percent were engaged in curriculum planning revision.

"If the data of this research are reasonably valid," Halvarson concluded, "a chief development officer can function as an external coordinator and internal catalyst in his institution. He has a role identity as fund raiser, policy officer, institutional planner, internal communicator, and, not least of all, educator. Skilled in communication and human persuasion, his on-campus internal role and contribution is probably more indirect than direct, more invisible than visible. Hence, the symbolic terms of catalyst, unifier, mediator, and coordinator."[165]

The *Newsletter* for May brought ACPRA members word that two of the Association's past presidents had died within ten days of each other in April, both after heart attacks. E. Ross Bartley, seventy-seven, president in 1949-50, had died on April 4 in Florida while on a vacation trip with his wife, Pearl. Lynn D. Poole, fifty-eight, president in 1956-57, had died in California on April 14 while he and his wife, Gray, were working on their twenty-ninth book.

Of the forty-five men and women who served as president of ACPRA during its first fifty-two years none was more widely quoted that Mike Radock.

Shortly after he assumed the presidency Radock wrote an article for *Public Relations Journal*, the offical organ of the Public Relations Society of America. The piece was quoted frequently thereafter because it suggested that the day might come when "an educational civil service" would run universities under policies set by a faculty administration elected for a set term of office. Students would also be involved, he said, but not in deciding policy questions.

"Whatever the arrangement, more professionalization of educational administration seems mandatory," Radock asserted. "Higher education is taking too great (and will require much more) an allocation of public and private investment to be left to amateur management. Today's educational administrators must deal with all echelons of government, with trade unions and professional associations, with virtually every kind of staff member, with a conglomerate of autonomous units, with private donors, with alumni, with parents, with vendors, with a governing board which may be publicly elected or politically appointed, with recruiters of the students, and competitors for his staff. *And* he's working with society's most highly valuable and precious resource—talented youth. All in all, he's involved in the most exciting and important of today's diversified growth industries."[166]

In addresses before the Public Relations Society's annual convention and at district meetings of ACPRA in five major cities, Radock made charges which were carried by the press associations and published by major newspapers throughout the country.

"Newspaper headlines and intensive coverage of student demonstrations by the electronics media have resulted in an image of the contemporary university as a conglomerate of protest, pot, pills, long hair, beards, beads, and unpatriotism," he declared.

"The great tragedy for institutions of higher education and for the great majority in the academic community—and for the society dependent upon and influenced by universities—is that the bizarre is being accepted as typical. But bizarre tactics, dress, and language, employed in confrontation politics are no more representative of the university as a whole than is Saturday afternoon on the football field."[167]

"Don't overreact to demonstrations," Radock advised his colleagues at district meetings. "Dissent is not necessarily disruption. Protest is not necessarily violent. We ought to guard against overreacting to long hair, bizarre dress, and bad language. These may conflict with common standards, but perhaps we need to increase our tolerance for conflict. We ought to try to hear the message. Surely we need to differentiate among issues, to consider each on its own merits, and to avoid escalating a minority issue into a majority cause by inept handling."

And in his final address as president Radock predicted that "the changing world of university relations will demand a much greater sophistication in the use of educational public relations in its broadest sense.

"We have an urgent need in higher education for leaders who can bridge the widening gap between the campus and the community. The public relations assignments are broadening because the place of education is growing in society; more people are seeking it, more competence is sought by more people because society demands it. Proportionately, education is consuming more of our resources. We prefer to call it investment, of course. But the fact is that education is taking a bigger share of taxes and personal income. That fact, alone is focusing more attention on education—public attention. . . .

"The public relations officer ought to be stretching his mind to cover the matters of current and future concern to his university president—at times calling them to the president's attention—and serving, really, as an added dimension of corporate awareness. Public relations is not just reaction. It also is initiation. It's not just putting out fires. It's anticipating where the hot spots may occur and taking fire prevention measures. And the public relations man can't do these things unless he fully understands what's going on in the world to which his enterprise relates."

Facing the 1970s: A Time to Lead

The ferment which had disrupted college campuses during 1968-69 continued in 1969-70, sometimes with even more violence than that which had marred the preceding year. Colleges continued to make the headlines and the television screens almost every day as students, faculty, and staff personnel protested against entanglement abroad and agitated for change at home, including a greater voice in the affairs of their institutions.

At the same time a slowing economy, governmental budget retrenching, and in some instances restrictive legislation brought financial strains unknown since the war years of the 1940s and early 1950s. Communities in which colleges and universities were located also began looking more closely at institutions, especially as students reflecting ideals or values alien to local people caused concern among these campus neighbors. Colleges and universities, as a result, had to deal more and more with city hall, law enforcement agencies, community groups, labor organizations, and the news media.

Public relations personnel were often caught in the middle of college problems. Increasingly they were being asked to act as the spokesmen for their institutions in dealing with off-campus groups. As they found themselves becoming more active and visible in areas which formerly were the concern of some other college officer, or in some cases of no previous concern to any administrator, they found themselves in need of additional knowledge in many fields—human motivation, politics, labor negotiations, law, and court procedures.

ACPRA's programs for the year, culminated by the 1970 national conference with "A Time to Lead" as its theme, reflected ACPRA's concern for the expanding responsibilities of the institutions and individuals on its membership roster. These responsibilities were emphasized even more after the Association moved into the new Center for Higher Education in December. It found itself increasingly in close liaison with some forty other national educational organizations. Now, more than ever, programs, projects, and services were geared to help provide leadership and indicate direction for institutional advancement programs, not just for the immediate future but for the coming decade.

Looking backward as he relinquished the presidency, Parry Sorensen held that the year's two most significant events were probably ACPRA's role in the massive Tax Reform Act of 1969 and the opening of the Research-Reference Center in January. New activities he listed as having major import were two special conferences, one on management aspects of college advancement, the other on future trends in science; a conference on bond issues designed especially for California community colleges; a seminar for Mexican university presidents on philanthropic support; and the completion and publication of *Casebook of Institutional Advancement Programs.*[168]

The Tax Reform Act, which initially threatened to eliminate financial support that had become the lifeblood of many institutions, was a major source of ACPRA effort and concern before it was signed by President Nixon in December. Through its Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy, headed by James W. Frick of the University of Notre Dame, and the committee's offshoot, the 501(c)(3) Group headed by Roland C. Matthies of Wittenberg, the Association spent considerable time in lobbying in Washington. The final law, as a result of this work, did not jeopardize fund raising for higher education to the extent originally feared.

It was, however, the most far-reaching modification of the tax law since 1913. It would have considerable effect on voluntary giving to higher education and demand the revision or elimination of some almost traditional development techniques.

As promised during the Radock administration, ACPRA moved quickly, once the act had been signed, to hold in Washington a conference to explore the implications of the new law. More than 400 member representatives attended the January 22-23 conference which covered, in four general sessions and question-and-answer periods, each addition and elimination in the new law and also the legislative language used. Because of the interest shown in this conference, the Association planned a follow-up program to be held as the 1970-71 year opened.[169]

During the first eight months of its existence, the Research-Reference Center, under the direction of Cletis Pride (who had come to the Association staff from Duke University), began developing information files covering specific topics in the areas of public relations and development, conducted three general interest surveys, and published *Casebook of Institutional Advancement Programs*. The first of the surveys, concerning educational and general budget trends, was published as a supplement to the June-July issue of the *Newsletter*. The other two, one aimed at constructing a profile of the typical deferred gifts officer and the other questioning administrators about proposed responses to campus political activity in November, were published early in the next fiscal year.

The *Casebook*, made possible by a grant from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, contained in a single binder 143 case studies on institutional program management, financial support, and public relations which had won awards in the National Honors Competition since 1964. The plan called for winning entries in future competitions to be printed annually and distributed to members for inclusion in their books.[170]

The first of the year's two special conferences, "Managing for Results," drew more than 150 registrants when held in Chicago for three days in February. Editor Brent Breedin summarized the statements of conference speakers on planning, implementing, and evaluating techniques to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of institutional advancement programs in a *College and University Journal* article entitled "A sampling of how one might go about managing for results."

Alvin C. Eurich, president of the Academy for Educational Development, ticked off eight "critical problems facing colleges and universities" as he delivered the keynote address, "Plan or Perish." These, he said, were: "(1) not enough money; (2) vague, not clearly defined objectives; (3) confused and hostile constituencies, including students, faculty, parents, and community groups; (4) anachronistic curricula; (5) outmoded and inefficient teaching techniques; (6) lack of enough top-quality teachers and administrators; (7) disagreement about top priorities; (8) inefficient use of plant and facilities."

"By and large," Eurich charged, "institutions of higher learning haven't give it [planning] the old college try. Without outside pressure, few colleges and universities would ever change anything significantly. And yet I think we are all agreed that changes—really significant changes—are needed in practically all institutions of higher learning. How can such changes come about? Planning is the rational, productive, and only feasible answer."

Eurich held that the increased tempo of change made it all the more necessary to plan. "Planning," he said, "is a tool for dealing with rapid change, a way of coping with the unexpected. A plan provides guidelines for measuring the validity of prior decisions. In the event of error, a sound plan, by offering these guidelines, increases the chances for corrective action before events run out of hand. In this sense, planning slows down the onrushing future. A plan keeps the college on course. . . . A plan, which has had the prior agreement of all concerned elements of the community, provides a built-in way of explaining and justifying the necessity of making difficult and often unpopular decisions."

The first essential step in planning is a commitment by the president, the other key administrative officers, and the trustees, Eurich asserted. The next step is to designate an administrative officer to be responsible for the planning. He listed six characteristics of an adequate plan: "(1) a description of the college as it now exists; (2) a clear statement of the goals of an institution which restricts its functions and does not promise to do all things for all students; (3) a set of assumptions for the future; (4) the projection of an educational program with methods for carrying it out and evaluating it regularly; (5) a statement of financial requirements to carry out the plan; (6) a provision for an adequate and regular accounting to the constituency of the college on how well or poorly the institution is doing in carrying out the plan."

"It is clear now that unless institutions make their own plans, someone else will do the planning," Eurich concluded, pointing out the tendency to depend on federal support and the dangers involved.

"In the wake of this support could come pressures toward standardized institutions which do an injustice to the diversity of student and institutional needs in America," he warned. "We must also fear the paralysis which could result from a massive higher education bureaucracy extending across the country. The best way I know for colleges to avoid these dangers is for them to do their own planning, for them to vigorously begin to chart their own futures. Power flows into a vacuum, and if the colleges allow a vacuum of planning to develop we can be sure that someone will take advantage of it. But, if colleges create sound plans then they will be in a much stronger position to resist encroachments from the outside."[171]

Francis C. Pray, a past president of ACPRA now chairman of Frantzreb and Pray Associates in New York City, delivered the final address at the management conference. He said that the times demanded the evolution of a whole new concept of development which he called "total resource development."

"By total resource development," he said, "I mean the mobilization of every possible resource needed to get on with the educational job. Money, sure—gifts and grants, deferred gifts—because this approach is well-defined, usable, and already professionally managed. But the physical plant is an educational resource. . . . Earnings, including tuition, are an educational resource. . . . The educational and teaching load is a resource. We in the education profession know, even from a hasty reading of the literature, that we haven't begun to explore possible new modes in education which might make possible a revolutionary change in the financing of our institutions and, *at the same time*, improve educational relevance and productivity."

Pray expressed belief that "a purely intellectualized approach, a purely planning approach, by planners, provides no great hope for significant change. The shelves of administrators' offices," he said, "are lined with bulky planning documents accomplished through the effort of outside counsel or by committees in planning offices on campus, gathering dust, serving primarily to provide a conscience-saving reply to be used when the trustees or others ask accusingly, 'What are your plans for the future?' "

Pray suggested a prototype for the development of the total resource potential of an institution. "In simplest terms," he said, "it is a college or university community approach to institutional planning and problem solving. It evolves best out of open discussion with the trustees, administration, key students, and faculty. I call it a 'task force', because I don't think that anybody is actually ready to put dimensions on it yet.

"It may involve as few as twenty or as many as thirty members with approximately equal representation from trustees, faculty, students, and the president's staff, with the addition of a couple alumni, parents, and perhaps a couple of public members. . . . The 'task force' provides for maximum communication among groups. It suggests an orderly process for the resolution of differences by providing machinery for examination of options in many dimensions and from many points of view. . . . The 'task force' should flow from trustee authorization and support, serve as the nexus of pressures for change, the consolidation and clearinghouse for ideas and special interests, and the source for consensus and recommendations to responsible elements of the institutional body. It may become, in a broader role, an arm of a community council which, if it can avoid power preoccupation, can be a powerful new tool for institutional survival."[172]

At ACPRA's request Pray also prepared a paper for the Special Committee on Campus Tensions created by ACE. This paper, called "The College and the Public—the Current Decline in Public Confidence; the Need for New Forms of Accountability and Ways of Interpreting the College to Various Publics," emphasized nine steps: "(1) Don't rely on general 'publicity'; (2) agree on basic principles about which there will be no negotiation; (3) the present crisis represents an opportunity; (4) zero in on known and identifiable audiences which matter; (5) plan specific programs tailored to specific relationships, responsibilities, and interests of known audiences; (6) emphasize person-to-person communication at the highest possible level; (7) use the public media—do not let them use you; (8) prepare for the long haul— and/or partial reprise; (9) face the issues with style."[173]

A $5,200 grant from the National Science Foundation enabled ACPRA to hold in April a Washington conference on "Communicating the Sciences in the '70s." Representative Emillie Q. Daddario, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, gave the keynote address. The three-day conference was planned to bring together members of the scientific community, media representatives, and academic information officers to examine subject materials, working relationships, and distribution methods.[174] No report on registrations was made following the conference, but at a meeting of the Executive Committee ten days before the workshop opened Executive Vice President Leslie reported that advance reservations "appeared somewhat disappointing" and commented that college cutbacks on travel expenses were in part to blame.[175]

The seminar on philanthropy for rectors (presidents) of ten Mexican universities, following two years of discussion, was held for two days in October at Cola de Caballo Hotel near Monterey. The Ford Foundation funded the seminar which covered the needs, sources, and methods for obtaining support for higher education. ACPRA's Committee on International Relations, headed this year by Patrick Nicholson of the University of Houston, sponsored this program in cooperation with Asociacion de Universidades e Institutos de Estudios Superiores. Also in October, ACPRA sponsored a conference in Los Angeles designed to help forty of the state's community colleges find new ways to obtain public acceptance for bond issues or tax-override campaigns. Speech excerpts which would relate to most community colleges in the country were then published in *Techniques* for July-August, 1970.

The California conference grew out of recommendations made by the Task Force on Developing Institutions headed by Dyar Massey. Before the year ended the Association was also implementing another of the Massey group's recommendations: that a basic reference manual be prepared for community college advancement program officers. In other national office efforts to help developing institutions, John Leslie assisted in planning an institute held by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and gave guidance to CASC in enlisting thirty consultants for an assistance program funded by a federal grant. John E. Bennett, assistant vice president of the Association and its director of educational conferences, meanwhile worked with the American Association of Junior Colleges and participated in its annual convention.[176]

Although no meeting of a Joint Liaison Committee of ACPRA and AAC members was held in 1969-70, discussion of common interests and problems was continued on an informal basis, especially after both organizations moved into the new National Center for Higher Education. Cordial discussion continued concerning whether national conferences should be held jointly or planned so that each organization would be responsible for a conference every other year with members of the other group invited to participate. In response to a questionnaire circulated after the 1969 conference, a majority of ACPRA members had indicated that they would be satisfied if conferences were held on an every-other-year basis.[177] The organizations were scheduled for separate conferences in 1970 but would meet simultaneously again in 1971 after which it was expected that a final decision on conference policy would be determined.[178] Because long-range planning for conferences was imperative, ACPRA determined that it would meet in Minneapolis in 1972 as previously planned, in San Diego rather than San Francisco in 1973, and in Atlanta in 1974. It was hoped that a firm policy on ACPRA-AAC conferences could be established by 1974 at the latest, in which case both organizations could meet in Atlanta.[179] To reduce costs for both the Association and those member representatives attending the annual national conference the Board of Trustees had meanwhile voted to shorten the 1970 and subsequent conferences to three days instead of three-and-a-half or more as in the past.[180]

Programs for conferences in ACPRA's nine districts in 1969-70 ran for three days each with one exception. In addition one-day workshops on special events and/or foundation relations preceded the annual meetings in five regions. Professional development, tax legislation, financial problems, internal relations, student unrest, and problems of junior and community colleges received most attention at the district meetings. Five of the districts also gave special attention to newcomers and the Great Lakes district appropriated $1,000 to enable twenty students from six states to participate in its conference. During two student panels it was learned that "the average student has little concept about the role of the public relations communicator" and that students are "many times totally ignorant of campus development."

The students attending unanimously urged continuation of the program format. One wrote: "Cooperation between the students and the administration is a must for a strong, progressive university and public relations officers should be leaders in developing better cooperation. Student involvement in your conference is a good move in this direction." Consequently, the district made the involvement of students a permanent feature of its conferences and year after year allocated $1,000 to assure their profitable participation.[181]

With the problems of colleges and universities multiplying and the responsibilities of

ACPRA members increasing as a consequence, the Association's national office, board, and Executive Committee expanded their programs accordingly.

The enlistment of consultants, originally undertaken as a service for black colleges, was expanded. Efforts were made to provide the counselors in teams when institutions so preferred.[182] In addition, a visiting practitioner program was proposed by John Leslie. It called for an occasional member to spend up to a month in the national office pursuing research or writing in an area of particular interest to him. Leslie anticipated that this program would enable the national office to commission participants to make in-depth studies of successful public relations and development programs, possibly for publication in an Association periodical.[183]

First steps toward a thorough study of institutional advancement programs were taken by the Executive Committee in April when it authorized $2,500 for preparation of a proposal for foundation support. The initial plan called for the study, directed by a paid person, to start with small groups to be followed by conferences to disseminate findings of such groups.[184] Because working with Congress and federal agencies was becoming an increasingly important part of college administration, the Executive Committee at the same meeting decided to present a workshop in 1970-71 meant to help colleges "develop more capability for effective expression" with these bodies. Plans for a Greenbrier II, hopefully to update the findings of the 1958 conference, were stalled temporarily by the resignation of the task force director after their initiation in June, 1969. In October Everett Hopkins of Duke, director of the earlier conference, agreed to assume leadership of the proposed project and plans were revived. The internship program which the Association had planned two years earlier went into limbo in the fall of 1969 after all efforts to gain the needed support had failed. The publication of literature to help attract students to college public relations was then authorized.[185]

When the Board of Trustees held its midwinter meeting, the twenty-nine members in attendance spent an evening in small group discussions meant to produce additional ideas for broadening Association services. The result was more than twenty ideas for future consideration, including the sponsorship of a workshop for speech writers; promotion of a Doctor of Philosophy degree in public relations; provision of special services for presidents and business officers of new and developing institutions and improved programming for such institutions at district meetings; addition of a development expert and later of an expert on community colleges to the national office staff; development of an information packet for new college presidents; and greater use of tapes and cassettes in national office services.[186]

The second phase of the college management study (started in 1962 and concluded in 1969 with the publication of *Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management*) was conducted in 1969-70 by John Leslie and the Association's research statistician, Annette L. Bacon. While the first study covered expenditures and gift income, bequests excluded, for 105 institutions during the 1962-66 period, the second covered the same items for 189 institutions for the years between 1965 and 1968. Results of the second study were reported in an eleven-page report published in *College and University Journal* under the title "Output = Input?"[187]

"While the cost of raising gift dollars has tended to remain approximately the same," the report said, "the amount of money expended by colleges and universities to raise gifts appears to have decreased as a proportion of funds expended on educational and general (E & G) purposes. At the same time, total gift income has increased."

Thirty state universities, nineteen private universities, and 140 private colleges supplied information for the study. Each of the three types of institutions was then divided into three groups—those which had raised from $100,000 to $499,999 annually, those which has raised $500,000 to $999,999, and those which had raised $1,000,000 or more.

State universities and private colleges generally had received less gift income in relation to their E&G expenditures during the 1965-68 period than during the 1962-66, while private universities had received slightly more, the study revealed. The thirty state universities and nineteen private universities had spent more for their institutional advancement programs (IAP), while the 140 private colleges had spent less. Annual median expenditures for the three types of institutions had been $282,000, $576,000, and $108,000, respectively, as compared to $220,000, $395,000, and $110,000, during the previous period. The proportion of E& G funds expended on IAP had decreased in private colleges by almost one percent and shown no increase in the universities. The cost of raising gift dollars—IAP expenditures as a percent of gift dollars—had also tended to remain approximately the same, increasing in state universities while decreasing in private colleges and universities.

"There were sixty-three institutions in the most recent analysis with gift income of one million dollars or more and the median cost for these institutions was ten to fourteen cents per dollar, the same as for the thirty-four million-dollar-plus institutions in the 1962-66 study," the report said. "Only eight of the sixty-three institutions had gift costs of over twenty cents. For the state universities in the $500,000 to $999,999 gift-income range, the median cost of gift dollars was between twenty-five and twenty-nine cents and for private colleges in the same gift-income range the median was fifteen to nineteen cents."

Considering gift income for E & G expenditures, the new study indicated that: (1) generally speaking, the higher an institution's gift income, the larger the percentage gift income was in relation to E & G expenditure; (2) gifts as a percentage of E & G decreased slightly after the 1962-66 study "but still represented a significant funding source, particularly for private universities and colleges with over $500,000 in gifts."

Advancement program expenditures among the 189 institutions had ranged from $30,000 to one million and no university or college with gift income of one million or more had expended less than $100,000 on its total public relations and development activities. The median annual expenditure for all responding institutions had been in the $100,000 to $199,999 range.

Median expenditure for professional salaries was found to range from thirty-five to thirty-nine percent of IAP for private institutions raising $1,000,000 or more to forty-five to forty-nine percent for state universities raising between $100,000 and $499,000. Salaries of managers—the individuals supervising the total IAP—were found to increase as size of staff increased, with those at state and private universities ranging from $17,500 to over $30,000 and those at private colleges from $10,000 to over $30,000.

The growing financial pressures on colleges and universities led the Board of Trustees to decide that dues, unchanged in general since 1964, should be continued at the current level as long as possible. One small change was made relating to multiple-campus universities and university-wide coordinating offices. Each such campus would henceforth, the trustees decided, pay its own fee on the basis of the enrollment on that campus. In addition, a system office, beginning in 1971-72, would pay a minimum fee of $100, plus the regular amount ($42) for additional member representatives.[188]

ACPRA itself was beginning to feel the financial pinch. For a time in mid-year there had been talk of suspending publication of the *Journal* or at least combining that publication with *Techniques*. No action was taken, however, but the trustees did reject an earlier suggestion that an editorial board for Association publications be named. A proposal that the Association, in the interest of economy, go to an alternate-year schedule for national meetings was also considered by the trustees but failed to get the necessary votes for passage.[189]

The Winter, 1970, issue of the *Journal* used ten pages to acquaint ACPRA members with the National Center for Higher Education, its new headquarters at One Dupont Circle. More than 300 educational organizations were headquartered in Washington and the eight-story building was to be the symbol of unity in higher education. According to the 1968 annual report of the Kellogg Foundation, whose $2.5 million grant had enabled the American Council on Education to erect the building, "a system of priorities [for selecting tenants] had to be set up" with priority being given "to associations needing to be in frequent communication with each other, the so-called 'constituent organizations group'."

In serving its tenants in the new building, ACE listed as its purpose: "to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions."[190] The special section in the *Journal* sketched the backgrounds, purposes, and activities of the forty tenants housed in the building.

In the Spring, 1970, issue of the *Journal*, Landrum Bolling, president of Earlham College, listed his "own secret set of rules on how to survive and be happy though surrounded by college students." First of these, he said, was: "Listen, because you won't learn much from young people if you do all the talking." The other seven: "(1) Keep smiling—a large percentage of us of the older generation unconsciously or deliberately glare, sneer, or frown when we look at college students; (2) don't ask them why they look the way they do—if they can't explain it to their parents, they can't explain it to you; (3) don't tell them how hard and how joyfully you worked in your youth—theirs is a different world; they have no conception of the world through which we lived in the Depression and World War II; (4) level with them—they are amazingly open and honest, if you approach them in a spirit of openness and honesty; (5) don't try to be one of them—among the most pathetic creatures over thirty are those synthetic adolescents who try to dress, talk, act, and look like college students; (6) share with them your highest hopes and finest purposes—it will surprise and delight them to discover that plenty of old people are idealists, too; (7) believe in them—they'll sense it when you do and, as in all generations, they will respond, eventually, to that belief."[191]

Early in 1970 President Nixon proposed the establishment of a National Foundation for Higher Education, with a 1972 budget of $200 million to carry out these three broad purposes: "(1) to provide a source of funds to encourage excellence, innovation, and reform in higher education; (2) to strengthen post-secondary educational institutions or courses of instruction that play a uniquely valuable role in American higher education or that are faced with special difficulties; and (3) to provide an organization concerned with the development of national policy in higher education." Editor Breedin of the *Journal* had sent background on the proposed foundation to several ACPRA member representatives and other interested educators, then presented their reactions in an article. Most members, including three past presidents of ACPRA, responded with skepticism, especially with regard to the third purpose. H. Russell Bintzer, ACPRA president in 1962-63 and now vice president for university relations at Drexel University, wrote: "So far as I am concerned this is one more stone laid down in the path leading higher education in our nation to full dependence on the public till accompanied by the inevitable bureaucratic oversight. The third of the three broad purposes set down for the foundation should provide all the evidence required."[192]

ACPRA's on-going programs, four of them held in connection with the national conference at Denver July 6-8, were followed by the Summer Academy in August to climax activities for the year. The academy program, after a multiple-course offering for three years, was now limited to the basic course for newcomers to the field, because of insufficient enrollment in the advanced-course offering. A growing interest in college management was indicated when more than 200 individuals registered for a School of Management held for two days preceding the national conference, and over 750 attended the conference. "Time to Lead" was the conference theme and major addresses carried such titles as "The Need for Leadership," "The Courage to Lead," and "Take Me to Your Leader."[193]

William J. McGill, newly-elected president of Columbia University, emphasized the professional interdependence of college presidents and public relations directors in his address on "The Courage to Lead."[194]

"If we university administrators do our jobs well," he said, "your lives are made more tranquil; if you manage our public affairs well, we can find those precious instances of breathing room that chancellors and college presidents cherish. This professional interdependence is a simple truth which most of the public doesn't understand. But we understand it and our joint success is essential to the peaceful transformation of our universities and to the better world we both seek."

McGill declared that the real power balances on campus are the faculty, students, and trustees. "Yet the phenomenon of institutional personalization inevitably requires that all the subtleties of such relations will be hidden from public view."

"The president alone pays the ultimate price for whatever goes wrong," he said, "just as he gets undue credit for whatever success the institution achieves. This means that a professional effort must be made to counteract the buffeting that is a necessary consequence of the president's daily decision making. . . . A president does not get to the position he holds without the graces that give him a good public presence. His professionals in public affairs must then analyze his institution's problems in order to choose the circumstances in which his personality and commitment can generate a reservoir of public sympathy and trust. These presentations yield the public credit that provides a cushion of protection when trouble comes.

"I know that many college presidents want to be removed from the public and the sharp hostility that public contact engenders. Your professional help must then be used to convince him to capitalize on these situations. His performance in the face of criticism can often be useful for developing a grudging acceptance of the view that here is a man of integrity who does not run away under fire."

The IBM Corporation had announced in December that it would provide a grant of $22,000 to enable the Association to continue its two honor programs through 1972. The annual allocation from this gift would provide at least six incentive grants of $500 each and finance the preparation and publication of award-winning case study abstracts for distribution to the membership.[195] Entries in both the National Honors Competition and the Publications Leadership Awards Competition consequently jumped to record highs. Incentive grants in both programs were awarded at the national conference, those in the National Honors Competition going to the University of Iowa for governmental relations, to Cornell University for annual giving, and to Iowa State University and Marquette University for special events. The grants in the Publications Leadership Awards Competition went to the University of Notre Dame, Fisk University, and Hollins College for total publications program and to Beloit College, Lehigh University, and University of Notre Dame for publications program improvement. Fourteen institutions were awarded certificates of special merit in the National Honors Competition while sixty-one received similar recognition in the publications competition.[196]

Seventy-one papers were submitted for the Association's "new look" sessions, an ongoing program since its introduction by Michael Radock in 1965. Twenty-four of these were chosen for presentation during the 1970 conference after which they were published in *Techniques* and other Association periodicals.[197]

Two lawyers who had been involved with the new federal tax legislation and two past presidents of the Association were honored at the conference banquet. Conrad Tertell, editor of *Taxwise Giving* and a partner in Prerau and Tertell, and John Holt Myers, partner in Williams, Myers, and Quiggle, received awards for distinguished service to higher education for their work on behalf of higher education in the development of the Tax Reform Act of 1969. James H. Denison of Michigan State University, ACPRA's president in 1964-65, received a presidential citation "for providing leadership under which the Association began a realistic financial program and adopted operational policies which gave stability and resulted in a steady growth in membership." Edward P. VonderHaar of Xavier University, president in 1952-53, received a similar award "for outstanding contributions in the public relations field over many years" and as the only person who had served as president of both ACPRA and the Public Relations Society of America.

Six past presidents of the Association, W. Emerson Reck, 1940-41; Edward D. Whittlesey, 1943-44; Harold K. Schellenger, 1946-47; Horace Renegar, 1947-48; W. Henry Johnston, 1951-52, and Francis C. Pray, 1954-55, were included among twenty-five men and one woman to whom the Board of Trustees in July voted the Association's first Seasoned Sage Awards. They were given "in recognition of twenty-five years or more of service to advance the understanding and support of higher education." Martha Von Briesen, director of public relations at Sweet Briar College, was the only woman recipient of the award. The remaining nineteen recipients, some of whom were no longer members of the Association, were Reynold E. Anderson, John Det[illegible] the Reverend Arthur Dussault, A. William Engel, David D. Fleming, Rafe Gibbs, Charles A. Hall, George H. Holmes, William Keys, Eugene Kone, Alan Lafflin, Jesse R. Long, Eugene Mann, Roland C. Matthies, David L. Roberts, Fred Shideler, Eugene Sloan, Claude J. Webb, and Cleland B. Wyllie.[198]

Although colleges and universities had begun to look sharply at every item in their budgets, ACPRA's membership jumped to 1,244 institutions and more than 3,650 member representatives, plus 125 educational associates and subscribers, thus providing dues income of more than $25,000 beyond expectations. Returns from investments, now a considerable item in the income side of the ledger, also jumped some $9,000 to more than $21,000. On the other hand income from conferences dropped approximately $23,000. The year's financial report revealed that both income and expenses had gone above $400,000 for the first time in the organization's history. Expenses had been $401,030, but income, contrary to early fears of a deficit, had soared to $418,-054. The Association's net worth was now less than $400 short of $300,000.[199]

The presidential gavel was passed to Duane A. Dittman of St. Lawrence University at the conference business meeting on July 8. James W. Frick of the University of Notre Dame was named president-elect and Gordon B. Strayer of the University of Iowa renamed secretary. Other newly-elected members of the Executive Committee were James H. Baker, Boston University; Robert G. Waldo, University of Washington; and Curtis A. Wood, Prairie View A & M College.[200]

Like his predecessor, President Sorensen made no address at the national conference and spoke only briefly, if at all, at district meetings attended during the year. When he did speak, however, and in scores of communications with his trustees and committees, he emphasized a conviction of long standing: that institutions and individual members of the Association ought to spend more time and effort on student and faculty relations instead of worrying so much about external publics. "I think," he was wont to say, "that the old saw about public relations working from inside out holds as true today as the day it was first uttered."[201]

The campus turmoil which peaked again in the spring had led one wag to suggest that the theme for the national conference should have been "A Time to Leave" rather than "A Time to Lead." In his final report, Soresen saw challenge ahead for every member of the Association.

"Higher education," he said, "has known difficult times in the past and will certainly survive the present tumult. But the condition in which it survives—its shape and substance in the future—is dependent upon competent, enlightened leaders. If ACPRA can help shape competent, enlightened leaders, its work will be a success. The responsibility does not begin or end with the national office and trustees, but rests with every member representative. We must not turn this into a decade of default. The 1970s must be 'A Time to Lead'."[202]

11

On Course to a Greater Future

ACPRA and ACC Plan Joint Study

During his administration Parry Sorensen had taken care, through personal contacts, to keep open the lines of communication with the American Alumni Council. Then, even before he had accepted the presidential gavel, Duane Dittman forged strong links with his counterpart in the Council, Robert B. Rennebohm of the University of Wisconsin Foundation. These ties would lead, after four more years, to the merger of AAC and ACPRA into an entirely new organization—the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

In private meetings, the two leaders discussed ways in which their organizations could "rise to the challenge and provide a positive direction for our groups when our colleges and universities are faced with a growing lack of confidence from those about whom we care the most."

"You are aware as I am," Dittman then wrote to Rennebohm in June, 1970, "that the financial tightening-of-the-belt in our institutions calls for increased efficiency and sharpened sense of purpose and is accompanied by a new level of inquiry from our common friends in foundations, corporations, and other organizations as to what our two associations can do to work out better relationships and programming."[1]

After AAC's 1970 conference was held in New Orleans in early July, Rennebohm wrote Dittman that his Board of Trustees believed that, rather than having a joint conference in Washington in 1971, the two organizations should hold separate conferences. These could be held in adjacent hotels so members could attend sessions of either organization as they pleased. Joint programs at that time, the AAC board felt, "would be unsatisfactory and inadequate because of the sheer weight of numbers and the wide variety of programs required to satisfy the several specialists we both have." The Miami conference held in 1968 with AAC as host and that held in New York in 1969 with ACPRA as host had not been completely satisfactory, Rennebohm and his board felt, because "we both tried to be all things to all people. . . . We feel it is very desirous—yes mandatory—for us to make it possible for those who have joint memberships to benefit from both conferences at the least possible expense to their institutions." Rennebohm at the same time emphasized the unanimous desire of AAC's trustees for "complete cooperation with ACPRA in all matters of mutual concern."[2]

Another decisive meeting between Dittman and Rennebohm took place in Portland, Oregon, early in February, 1971. It led to a decision to hold an informal meeting of AAC and ACPRA leaders in Chicago on April 13 after ACPRA's Executive Committee had completed a two-day session there earlier that day. In preparation for the meeting Dittman wrote to the other men who would represent ACPRA—James W. Frick, the Association's president-elect; Michael Radock, president in 1968-69 and a long-time advocate of federation or merger; and Sorensen.

"I have become even more convinced," Dittman wrote, "that it is impossible for the leadership of our two organizations to defend the continued inefficiency, uneconomical and splintering effort which affects our institutions. The question is whether we have the imagination to find a mutually agreeable new arrangement."[3]

Out of the informal meeting which the four leaders held on April 13 with Rennebohm and William S. Armstrong, president of the Indiana University Foundation and a former chairman of AAC's board, came a decision that a commission headed by an educator of national prominence should be named to make a thorough study of AAC and ACPRA programs and relationships. The study would determine what steps should be taken to assure greatest service from the two organizations in the future with minimum duplication of effort and expense. The group determined unanimously that Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, would be the ideal leader for the commission. Dittman and Rennebohm comferred with Wells at Indiana University on June 8.

Wells showed interest in the challenge. Two days later, Rennebohm wrote: "We appreciated the opportunity to tell you about the past relationship of these two fine organizations and for soliciting your good counsel on ways we can better serve our respective members in the future. We are very hopeful that your schedule and commitments will permit you to work with us on these problems and challenges."[4]

Dittman accepted the assignment of writing for Wells a summary of the proposal he and Rennebohm had made, and sent it to the Indiana educator on June 18. Objective of the study, Dittman reemphasized, would be determination of how AAC and ACPRA could better serve their member institutions and member representatives.

"We assume," he wrote, "that our common interest will make it possible, in the interest of economy and elimination of duplicated programs, to improve our services. The questions are: What relationships can be discovered which would make these ends possible, what means should be used to make the discoveries, and how should we proceed from where we are?"[5]

It had been proposed, Dittman wrote, to compose the study commission of eight persons in addition to the chairman: an alumni secretary and a development officer representing AAC, a public relations director and a development officer representing ACPRA, two public representatives, one of them a corporate or foundation officer and the other a business leader known to be interested in higher education, and two professionals well known to the membership of the two organizations. It was hoped, he said, that Wells could accept the chairmanship before the two associations met in Washington. Then the personnel could be selected and the committee start its work in September or October.

Wells had yet to make his decision when the two organizations held their national conferences, but ACPRA's trustees, apparently confident that he would accept, passed unanimously a resolution that, "concerned about the duplication of services between our two organizations, we do, with all good intentions and good will, authorize the appointment of a joint commission to study the relationship between the AAC and ACPRA."[6] The AAC board took similar action.

The leaders of AAC and ACPRA met on July 21, 1971, to determine guidelines for the study. The group included James Frick, then assuming the ACPRA presidency; Robert G. Waldo of the University of Washington, who had just been named president-elect of ACPRA; AAC Board Chairman Robert Rhodes of Brown University; AAC Chairman-elect Robert Linson of Ball State University; Rennebohm, and Dittman.

According to a report Dittman made to ACPRA's trustees, the leaders' group decided: (1) that outside financial aid would be sought for the study; (2) that the study would concentrate on programming for members of the two organizations with the elimination of duplication in existing services and the future mission of each association as primary concerns; (3) that the study should start as soon as possible and be concluded by May 1, 1972, to allow proper consideration by each organization prior to the annual conferences scheduled for July.[7]

At last, on October 4, 1971, President Frick was able to report that Wells had accepted the invitation to serve as the study leader.[8]

To plan for its separate convention in 1971, ACPRA named David S. Thompson, assistant to the president of Princeton University, as conference chairman. Planning started for a program which would be known as the "Washington Assembly" and complete a year of emphasis on capital-campus liaison. The major focus of the assembly program was Capitol Hill Day, which found most of the 870 delegates swarming up the Capitol's steps to the Chamber of the U. S. House of Representatives for an historic session at 10 a.m. on July 20. Soon most of the delegates were settling in seats normally occupied by Congressmen, and when these were filled others stood along the walls or filled the visitors' gallery.[9]

In his welcome to the conferees, House Speaker Carl Albert pointed out that no group of this size had ever before had the privilege of holding a session in the House Chambers. Before House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford adjourned the session seventy-five minutes later, the conferees had heard Carl Perkins of Kentucky, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, and four members of the Special Subcommittee on Education—John Brademas of Indiana, John Dellenback and Edith Green of Oregon, and Albert Quie of Minnesota—discuss higher education proposals before the House. All agreed that education was facing national crisis, that help was imperative, and that the method for helping was the problem.

From the House Chamber, the delegates moved to the auditorium in the Dirksen Senate Office Building. There they heard Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, discuss his higher education bill then under consideration by the Senate.

The higher education community was not without blame for some of the current confusion and indecision over financial aid, Pell charged. "It is ignoring what is going on in the Senate," he declared. "There seems to be a lack of willingness on the part of higher education to look with open minds."

After the delegates divided into groups representing ACPRA's nine districts and had lunch with congressmen from their areas, they assembled in the auditorium of the Health and Education Building for the final session of the day. The speakers, each of whom concentrated on some program for aiding higher education, were Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland, Peter P. Muirhead, executive deputy commissioner for higher education, and Preston Valien, acting associate commissioner of the Bureau of Higher Education.

The financial problems of higher education were foremost on the minds of ACPRA members. General sessions both on the day before and the day after Capitol Hill Day dealt with related subjects. As a warmup for the next day's program, the general session on July 19 was devoted to "The Current Status of Higher Edcuation Legislation" and "Legislative Process."

"When you are going to see Congressmen," Ralph K. Huitt, former assistant secretary for legislation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, told the delegates, "you are going to see politicians . . . and politicians need issues, audiences, money, and votes. They are interested in the way national issues relate to local issues. And," said Huitt, now executive director of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, "don't assume that because the House has done something the Senate knows about it and vice versa. Explain your position and the details of what it is you want your Congressman to support."

A growth of responsibilities and aspirations had caused about one-third of the current money crisis for colleges and universities, said Earl Cheit, author of the Carnegie Commission Study, *The New Depression in Higher Education*, and a research economist with the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California at Berkeley. He addressed the delegates on July 21 when their general session concentrated on "Future Financing of Higher Education." Student aid and faculty salary increases were each accountable for about one-fifth of the crisis, he said, and inflation and campus disturbances for much of the rest.

Speaking at the same session, Hans H. Jenny, vice president for business and finance at the College of Wooster, suggested three remedies for college financial problems: (1) student aid, including aid for the middle-income group, so that a student's choice of college would not be based solely or largely on money; (2) greater equalization between the private and public sectors on funding; and (3) development of a pro-philanthropy state of mind. "Most colleges," he said, "depend on private philanthropy. Imagine how much the government would have to supply if there were no philanthropy."

At the conference, only one joint AAC-ACPRA general session was held. This was the keynote session which opened the conferences. Edwin Etherington, president of the National Center for Voluntary Action, explained the purpose of his organization: to coordinate the efforts of those wishing to volunteer for community work and those needing volunteers for special projects. He suggested the establishment of campus centers which would give students a place to exert their idealism beneficially and would improve relations between campus and community by making campus facilities and faculty experts available to community residents.[10]

Held in connection with the annual conference for the seventh year, the School for Educational Administrators (originally called School for Public Relations and Development Officers) added a new dimension to its program, "Management Measurement," to provide registrants with a quick course in management relating to their interest areas."[11]

The Washington Assembly was in fact the third program ACPRA had undertaken during the year to promote capital-campus liaison. First of these was the special tax conference triggered by the release of IRS definitions of the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Held in Washington on September 29, this conference attracted nearly 300 individuals who heard IRS representatives and tax attorneys discuss all facets of the new regulations.[12]

Second of the programs meant to promote better federal liaison was a "Washington Looks at the Campus" conference, attended by more than 160 ACPRA members and thirty-five representatives from Congress, federal agencies, and education associations. At this December meeting, ideas were discussed for developing government relations and exploring resources the government had to offer colleges and universities. Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota, the keynote speaker, told the conferees they should "get tough with Congress in getting their message across." Other speakers emphasized that communications with Congress should be frank and factual but not overblown; that members of ACPRA had a responsibility to volunteer their views to educational associations, Congress, and federal agencies; that a gap existed "between the perception of national policymakers about the state of affairs on the nation's campuses and the true nature of problems of higher education"; and that the best way to bridge the gap would be to give Congress and the federal government specifics, not generalizations, on problems affecting colleges.[13]

Executive Vice President Leslie had to report in December that ACPRA had not been able to raise the $26,000 needed to publish a bibliography of all college advancement-related articles and books printed in the last ten years and produce "Info-Kits," a series of microfiche planned to contain helpful information about the many varied assignments public relations offices were called upon to undertake. However, the Board of Trustees authorized Cletis Pride to move ahead on both projects.

A number of corporations, it was reported, were giving up their idea of foundation giving. Instead, they were turning to the "pet project" type of giving. The problem of fund raising was aggravated by the Tax Reform Act of 1969, seemingly so complex as to discourage contributions to institutions and foundations. To provide part of the money needed ACPRA decided to use a $10,000 unrestricted grant received earlier from the United States Steel Foundation.[14] As a result, Leslie was able to report in July that progress had been made on the bibliography. Meanwhile, Pride had produced and mailed to subscribers ten of the fifty Info-Kits proposed for production in the first two years of Research-Reference Center activity. Titles of the first ten kits included "Internal Communications—Faculty, Staff, Employee," "Organizing, Staffing, and Budgeting the Development Office," "Campus Crisis—Disruption," "The Presidential Inauguration," "Public Relations: Town and Gown," and "Using Radio and Television in Educational Public Relations." All kits were made available either on microfiche or as hard copy. Pride announced that henceforth he expected to produce about two kits a month.[15]

Pride also initiated three other projects during the year. First came publication of a folder, *Hard Times in Higher Education*. The folder, containing excerpts from the Carnegie Commission Report, *The New Depression in Higher Education*, and designed as a supporting document in fund-raising campaigns of all types, was so popular that 500,000 copies had to be printed.[16]

The second project was designed to help institutions whose budgets did not permit employment of the specialists needed to produce quality publications. Subscribers would receive bimonthly camera-ready articles, cartoons, drawings, sketches, photographs, and designs along with expert advice, if requested. Pride created material for this Creative Publications Service in cooperation with Interpreting Institutions of Baltimore.[17]

As the third project, Pride initiated a series of surveys through the *Newsletter*. The first related to the 1970 survey on political activities of students, which appeared in the September/October issue. According to the survey, few institutions expected to adopt the "Princeton Plan" calling for cancellation of classes while students and faculty campaigned. While many institutions were making provisions for students to hear addresses by or debates between candidates for public office, few actually expected a majority of their students to participate in political campaigns. And virtually none believed that an opportunity to campaign would take the edge from future campus dissent.

The second survey reported that the typical deferred gifts officer in higher education had practiced for four years, the last two in his present post. He devoted three-fourths of his time to deferred giving and the remainder to such tasks as major or annual giving, general solicitation, and parents' programs. A few served as institutional or departmental legal counsels. Law school graduates had found their training especially valuable in deferred giving work. Business and the social science courses were held to be the next most valuable. About fifteen percent had found an insurance background especially useful, while others recommended community service, advertising, public relations, and professional fund raising. The most frequent title held by the deferred gifts officer was director of deferred giving, although titles including the term "estate planning" were a close second. Nearly all of these officers reported to a director of development or vice president. Pride also learned that most deferred giving programs were relatively new: the median age was six years with twenty-five percent three years or younger. The oldest program had been organized seventy years earlier.[18]

Announcement was made late in the summer of 1970 that the Esso Education Foundation had granted ACPRA $11,800 to continue its college management study. Started in 1966, the program had produced the book, *Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study of College Management*, and a *College and University Journal* article called "Output = Input?" To continue the study the Board of Trustees gave Executive Vice President John Leslie a four-month leave of absence of January through April. The overall purpose of this study would be "to analyze the communication and acquisition process employed by various colleges and universities in securing gifts, appropriations, grants and contracts, and tuition income and attempt to determine organizational and institutional guidelines for executive officers."[19]

In reporting to the board, Leslie said that "the real need is for coordinated effort and a logical assignment of resources. . . . There is great inflexibility in higher education, a fact which can be self-defeating in such areas as financial support management. I saw very little innovation in the management of financial support and communication programs, many of which are the victims of little real planning and poor management. Some financial program managers pay little attention to current business techniques such as management by objective, programming, planning, and budgeting."[20]

Like the effort to get foundation grants for the Research-Reference Center, the attempt to raise $75,000 for summer internships first proposed five years earlier had met with no success. Although the Board of Trustees agreed that there was "a very real need for such a program to help assure a continued flow of qualified personnel for college advancement programs," it reluctantly dropped the project late in 1970.[21]

Still another project ACPRA had been considering for several years, Greenbrier II, was dropped because of the changing trend in foundation giving. Reporting to the Board of Trustees, Dittman said that plans for the conference, proposed originally as a means for strengthening the Association's impact on foundations and other granting agencies, had been shelved "in part because of the difficulty of articulating a satisfactory rationale and program for such a conference."[22]

By this time the nation had approximately 1,000 junior colleges, most with no designated advancement program officer. ACPRA moved to expand its program of assistance for these institutions. A trustee committee headed by Robert T. Loschen, assistant to the president at Washington State Community College, presented in December a six-point program which the board adopted with a commitment to implement as fast as Association funds permitted. The program called for ACPRA to: (1) seek spots on national programs of the American Association of Junior Colleges in order to reach decision makers face to face; (2) gather the best examples of problem-solving help and make them available to community college administrators "through a creative, professional public relations program"; (3) devise guidelines for public relations administration, aimed at community college administrators and including factual information on staffing, budget, and administrative relationships; (4) support, in connection with district meetings, workshops on bond elections, legislative relations, community research, publications, use of electronic media, and other subjects of special interest to community colleges; (5) sponsor, through the districts, consultant services to be provided by established professionals within the districts; and (6) make extra effort to get community college representatives to attend and feel welcome at district meetings.[23]

Four months later ACPRA voted to undertake with the AAJC the development of a manual of guidelines for public relations and development programs for two-year colleges.[24]

Most of the districts were already working sessions for community colleges into their annual conference programs. They found that workshops were popular in connection with their conferences, and three districts were continuing to hold their annual meetings jointly with their counterparts in AAC. The most significant development in the district program in 1970-71, however, was the holding of a conference in Mexico for the first time. Workshops on publications and deferred giving were among program features for the conference held in Juarez by the Southwest District on April 6-7.[25]

Instead of combining *College and University Journal* and *Techniques* as proposed the preceding year, ACPRA starting in January, 1971, adopted an expanded schedule for the former. A quarterly for nine years, it now became a five-times-a-year publication appearing in January, March, May, September, and November. *Techniques*, currently published six times a year, also assumed a five-times-a-year schedule, in February, April, June, October, and December. Content and size changes were now made in the *Journal*, its thirty-two-page-issue being devoted largely to a specific theme. Also featured in each issue was a new section, "Information Digest," devoted to five or six relatively brief items on a wide variety of subjects related to the interests of Association members. Along with its new publishing schedule *Techniques* began to accept advertising, as the *Journal* already did.[26]

The theme for the *Journal's* first issue under the new schedule was the increasing role of government in higher education. Breedin, in an introduction to eight articles by government officials, educators, and representatives of organizations associated with higher education, emphasized the potency of government in relation to higher education. In the fifty states, he pointed out, there were 1,938 senators and 5,695 members of lower houses; in the nation's capital, 100 senators and 435 representatives. The contributions of state governments to higher education had increased from $61,864,000 in 1919-20 to $4,219,668,000 in 1967-68, while those of the federal government had jumped from $12,783,000 to $3,363,140,000 in the same period of time.

"Higher education's need to communicate with state and federal legislators was never greater than it is today," Breedin declared. "And bridging the gap between educators and legislators has become unduly complicated in post-World War II America. The layers of aides and administrators that have been added on both sides have ended the one-on-one scene of yesteryear where the state college or university president discussed his school's needs almost informally with the governor and key legislators. These discussions may still take place, but the behind-the-scenes activities leading to them involve dozens of individuals. . . . What must be remembered is that legislators are subject to even greater accountability than educators. They go before the people, in most instances, every two years. And on an issue as important and costly as higher education they'd better have the right answers for their actions. Colleges and universities can help provide these answers in many ways, and in providing them they can assure that the campus-state relationship is one of mutual respect and not suspicion."[27]

All of the eight authors agreed that "government has a critical place in the future of higher education," but some indicated a degree of uneasiness, large or small, over this fact.

"Power is allocated with money and it has already been redistributed substantially by federal aid," wrote Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The great beneficiaries in terms of money, he said, had been the faculties—but the great beneficiaries in terms of power redistribution had been the agencies in Washington and the Congressional committees.

"The agencies in Washington," he said, "have assumed some of the authority over funds and functions once held by the president of the institution and trustees; the panels that advise them, some of the influence once held by committees on educational policy and research and buildings and space assignments of the organized faculty; and the Congressional committees that set the priorities and vote the funds, some of the impact once held by the committees of the state legislature, by foundations, and by major donors. Washington has drawn great power and influence into its many hands. Not so long ago it was almost ignored by higher education, but not now or ever again. The sum of $4.7 billion has made the difference."[28]

How state government in Illinois had enabled private colleges and universities to retain independence was shown by Arthur Schaefer of DePaul University, ACPRA president in 1961-62. The Illinois State Program for Scholarships and Grants, a pioneer in state aid to higher education, had made a total of $32,260,000 available to 46,827 students in its twelfth year, 1969-70. This meant that about fifty percent of DePaul's students received help from the state program.

Schaefer pointed out that the Illinois program, as adopted by the state's Board of Higher Education, had included certain basic assumptions highly important to the state's private colleges and universities: "(1) The opportunity to study in institutions of higher education should be available to all young people who may reasonably be expected to benefit from such study. (2) The principle of free choice by the student among the various institutions, large or small, public or nonpublic, should be maintained so far as consistent with admission policies and effective use of resources within the state. (3) There are advantages that result from the presence in our society of both public and nonpublic institutions; diversity among institutions has made and is making distinctive contributions to social progress, providing a wide range of educational opportunity for varied individual needs."[29]

Daniel P. Moynihan, counselor to President Nixon, also contributed an article to the *Journal*.

"The Administration," he wrote, "has emerged with a fundamental conclusion: Increasingly it appears to us that reliance on categorical aid programs as the principal source of federal support for higher education is fundamentally subversive of the principle of noninterference. A categorical aid program is by definition a form of federal interference in the internal affairs and priorities of the university community.

"That is why one is bemused when members of the academic community get upset over reductions in any one of the many categories of federal aid. Such reductions—which are more than matched by increases elsewhere, total federal outlays for higher education having risen every single year since 1960—simply reflect changed national interests, changed priorities, if you will. When the higher education community allowed itself to get into the business of accepting categorical grant money from the federal government, it accepted an implicit condition, which was that no category was permanent or immutable. When a private institution allows itself to become dependent on support that is itself subject to the political process, it entangles itself in a sequence that it is largely powerless to control. And it certainly runs the risk of being victimized by the political forces that govern the money; but one would have to be paranoid indeed to think that the federal government's changes in emphasis in recent years amounted to victimization."[30]

Richard C. Olson, executive assistant to Representative Morris K. Udall of Arizona, contributed an article. Some readers detected cynicysm in the midst of advice which could be highly beneficial to those seeking aid for higher education.

"Congress responds to pressure, not to polite requests," Olson wrote. "It is a political institution. It thinks and breathes politics. The eye of every member is on the next election. It's also on the next bill on which he is going to need colleague support. And it's on his relations with his committee chairmen, the leadership of his party, the editors of the big papers in his home district, the views of important constituents—all these political things.

"The way to get things done in Congress is to deal with it as it is—not as you would like it to be. In my experience, the only time Congress ever passes any truly new or controversial bill is when a majority of the members think they absolutely have to do it—when they imagine it would be political suicide NOT to vote for it." Olson complained that Congress usually didn't hear from anybody in higher education until it was time to hit the panic button.

"And suddenly," he declared, "we're getting telegrams to save a cause that's already lost. You have a great potential of good will in Congress. Nearly everyone in every Congressional office is a potential ally of higher education. But there is only so much we can do. We need your help all along the line if this political system—which is seen as practicing the art of the impossible—is going to work to advance the cause of higher education in this country."[31]

Three surveys were also included in the section of the January *Journal* devoted to governmental relations. One of these, concerning alternative methods of federal funding for private liberal arts colleges, showed that only four college presidents queried favored tax relief. Forty favored aid to students as the best method, most of them through a program modeled after the G.I. Bill. Although twenty-seven presidents regarded grants to institutions as the best method of federal funding, eight regarded it as the poorest method. Such grants, said some, would be a crutch that could be pulled from under colleges at any time. Some also feared that this type of grant would lay colleges open to federal intervention and control. Categorical aid and revenue sharing were also frowned upon as methods of federal aid by most presidents.[32]

In March, the *Journal* brought its readers another update installment of the continuing management study ACPRA was conducting with an Esso Foundation grant. This one, "Trends in Campus Advancement," written by Annette L. Bacon and Cletis Pride, followed up on certain aspects of earlier studies. This latest survey covered 241 institutions—thirty-nine state universities, twenty private universities, and 182 private colleges.

It showed that press releases and other services to the mass media continued to absorb the most time of educational public relations offices—state universities, fifty-five percent; private universities, fifty percent, and private colleges, forty percent. The survey also revealed that private colleges were more active in community relations than universities and that they were more likely to zero in on special publics such as church constituencies, parents, and alumni.

"Public relations" was still the term most frequently used in titles of college and university officers concentrating on advancement activities. In only eighteen of the 241 institutions did the term "information" appear in the director's title, and such new descriptive terms as "communications" and "public affairs" were being used infrequently.[33]

"Business and Higher Education" was the theme of the *Journal* in May, 1971. Business support for higher education, said Editor Breedin, now represented only fifteen percent of the voluntary funds received yearly by higher education, compared to seventeen percent in 1966-67. The business community by this time included more than one-and-a-half million corporations but most of these, including many of those large enough to be shown on the *Fortune* lists, were doing little or nothing in the way of aiding higher education. Business leaders expressing opinions in the special section, however, were strong in their belief that business needed to give maximum aid to higher education.[34]

"It seems to me," wrote E. Kent Damon, vice president, secretary, and treasurer of the Xerox Corporation, "that the support of higher education by business is not only inseparable from the future health of the enterprise, but inseparable . . . from the total health of global society."

"In order to enable higher education to serve society to its fullest capabilities in the decade ahead, business must be ready to give, and give until it hurts," wrote Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman of Kaiser Industries Corporation. "Both our confidence and our financial support are equally essential to maintain the nation's campuses as open societies where truth and knowledge may honestly be pursued in freedom from externally imposed political and financial controls."

D. Robert Beaman, chairman of the Contribution Committee of the Kimberly-Clark Foundation, and Harry B. Hensel, president of Bulova Watch Company, advanced ideas which they felt would lead to increased giving by business.

"There is a common ground available to college administrators and business executives," Beaman said. "Both must be effective managers if they are to be successful. If those in business were made aware that their counterparts in education knew and were applying principles and techniques of modern management, I believe they would feel freer to commit some of the shareholders' money to the institutions' needs."

"Certainly they [the colleges and universities]," Hensel emphasized, "should expose their top administrative and academic people to their local business counterparts on every possible occasion so that any areas of mutual interest can be easily identified and exploited."

Belief that colleges, universities, and business "should begin to practice a more positive and more confident stance about the usefulness of state associations" was expressed by Byron K. Trippet, president of Independent College Funds of America. "If twenty years ago anyone had predicted that this method of appealing for corporate support would attract on the order of $200 million by 1970, few people would have believed it," he declared. "The plain fact is that the association method has been and continues to be a very powerful influence in corporate aid to higher education generally."[35]

James C. Hardie, secretary of the Corporate 1% Program for Higher Education, Inc., in Cleveland, explained the workings of his organization's plan. *Reader's Digest* had called it "America's Greatest Partnership . . . Corporations and Colleges" and the New York *Times* had lauded it as "one of the most inventive and promising developments in meeting the problems of financing higher education."[36]

The plan had had its beginning in 1959 at a meeting of the executive committee of the Case Institute of Technology Associates, a group of firms making annual contributions of at least $5,000 to Case's operating fund.

The plan was finalized by February, 1961, in a ten-paragraph document explaining the reasons for and workings of the plan. Corporations would commit themselves "to major increases in corporate contributions to higher education at once and increasing to a minimum of not less than one percent of income before taxes and thereafter gradually increasing as the need develops."

Twenty-one Cleveland corporations had adopted the compact. The results were shown in Hardie's article. With net income of $205,291,189 the companies had contributed $2,060,430 in 1961; by 1969 the corporate contributions had jumped to $6,864,337 from a net income of $741,155,023.

Interest in the Corporate 1% Program had reached such intensity by 1968 that a national office was opened, supported in part by a $250,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. By the time Hardie wrote, identical programs had been organized in four other states—New York, California, Tennessee, and Florida—and others were in the process of organization in Pennsylvania, Colorado, and West Virginia.

Samuel B. Gould, now chancellor emeritus of SUNY and a previous contributor to the *Journal*, contributed "Bridging the Interpretation Gap" to the final issue of the *Journal* for 1970-71. He said that higher education "must first of all be more truthful in its own evaluation of its current weaknesses." Among its major weaknesses, in Gould's opinion, were slowness in reacting to change, failure to have a clear concept of purposes and goals, poor stewardship of finances, and failure to reorganize itself to be closer to the constituents it served—students, faculty, alumni, and local community especially.

"A serious commitment of higher education to an effort toward gaining public confidence is bound to make the matter of self-interpretation paramount in importance," Gould asserted. "Therefore," he continued, "higher education should: (1) take the public into its confidence; (2) talk to the public in terms it can understand; (3) give more emphasis to its own positive achievements; (4) make sure that the public understands and appreciates the values of scholarship; (5) disclaim responsibility for what it has not brought about or what it should not be expected to control.

"Higher education," he concluded, "must take the offensive in leading the way toward adapting to the times all it does and how it does it instead of being content merely to find techniques for protecting itself. And it must do this within a framework of realistic expectations, whether academic or social or financial. Promises of change cannot be lightly made lest they return not only to haunt the maker but to crush him.

"There will always be those among the public who are unalterably opposed. . . . They can never be the friend of higher education regardless of how much we try to explain and interpret. But then everyone worth his salt has enemies; so has higher education. What we do not realize often enough is that higher education has a great host of friends who wish it well and who can be partners in the educational renaissance that is imminent. We need this kind of partnership and should work to make it a reality."[37]

The issue of the *Journal* featuring business and higher education marked the end of Brent Breedin's editorship. After five years as editor he announced his resignation in late March. On May 1 he moved down the hall from ACPRA to become associate director of the George Washington University-managed ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.[38] He was replaced the following November by Robert R. Hesse, who had been director of public relations at the State University College at Freedonia, New York, before becoming executive assistant to the president there in 1967.[39] Breedin did, however, continue to edit *Education Abstracts* for ACPRA.

What a college president needs from his public relations or development officer was outlined by Richard P. Bailey, president of Hamline University, in an article on "Building the President's Image" in *Techniques*. The president's seven needs, he said, had become an operational manual for the effective development man.[40]

"The president," he said, "needs loving criticism. He comes to the campus as a paragon of pedagogical profundity. As the image tarnishes from inauguration to resignation it is the development officer who must keep him informed of the developing dullness. The process may even be slowed by alert and timely criticism and correction. . . .

"The president needs loyal opposition as well as support. . . . One of the hazards of the office is the yes men and women who surround it. A president can always gain face-to-face agreement from favor seekers who cluster at his elbow. He needs disagreement to sharpen his decision, to clarify his dreams, and to solidify his plans. It is when a bouncing process of ideas against the obstacles of cost, tradition, and personalities takes place that progress is possible. . . .

"The president needs dedicated espionage. It is not necessary that the development man whisper juicy gossip in his ear. But it is essential that irritating molehills be reported on the horizon before they build up to threatening mountains to be climbed. It must never be assumed that the president knows what is going on. The chances are great that he doesn't. . . .

"The president needs irresponsible disinterest. . . . The responsibility of the president is not, I repeat, *not* that of the development man. The more irresponsible he is relative to the presidency the better he can carry out his task. When the development officer becomes protective and overly solicitous the impact of the president is blunted and softened. The president must be used and on occasion, abused. No one can stand between him and his responsibility to the institution.

"The president needs institutional patriotism. The criticism he needs (lovingly bestowed) does not extend to the institution he serves. . . .

"The president needs compassionate understanding. His assignment is exacting and difficult but he does have a life of his own with its little dreams and small successes. That secret life should be respected, protected, and never entered without knocking. . . .

"The president needs charitable forgiveness. . . . In the development office there needs to burn the divine incense of forgiveness. The president should be convinced that no matter how grave his goof there is one office which will try to understand; will offer charity; will extend forgiveness. That office, oh blessed assurance, is the office of development."

Bailey concluded by enumerating additional qualities he visualized in the ideal development man. "He understands the collegiate community and is at home with faculty members as remote from his interests as is physical education from physics. At meetings with trustees he contributes but makes no attempt to dominate. He has children of his own who can keep him flexible in the youthful revolution swirling over our campus today. He writes and speaks well, of course, but more important he works long and odd hours. His office is the friendliest place on the campus where one can always find a hot cup of coffee and a cool secretary. . . . He understands and loves me. I keep him humble."

ACPRA's ongoing programs attracted larger participation than ever before in 1970-71. Eighty-four papers were submitted for the "new look" sessions and thirty-eight of these were chosen for presentation at the national conference.[41]

Fifteen large cardboard cartons were needed to ship to the judges the 1,506 entries for the National Honors Competition and Publications Leadership Programs. Certificates of exceptional achievement and $500 IBM incentive grants were awarded Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Cornell University, American International College, Massachussetts Institute of Technology, California State Colleges, Duke University, and Hollins College. Eighteen institutions received certificates of special merit in the National Honors Competition and seventy-nine received such certificates in the Publications Leadership Program.

ACPRA's award for distinguished service to higher education in 1971 went to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, which in its five years of publication had become "perhaps the single most important communications medium in American higher education." At the same time the Association's presidential citation went to the University of Iowa whose internship program, in its twenty-fifth year, was cited for "its extraordinary contribution to the development of professional persons, and indeed, to the field of educational public relations."[42]

Thirty more individuals who had devoted twenty-five or more years to the advancement of support and understanding of higher education were added to the rolls of Seasoned Sages of ACPRA in 1970-71. Fifty-five members had been so recognized since establishment of the honor the preceding year.[43]

Two authors, Scott M. Cutlip, professor of public relations at the University of Wisconsin, and Steven Muller, provost at Johns Hopkins University, were selected to share *College and University Journal's* third Distinguished Article Award, made possible by a grant from Frantzreb and Pray Associates of New York City. Cutlip was honored for an article on what he called the seedbed years of college public relations (1870-1917). His piece appeared in the Fall, 1970, issue of the *Journal* under the title, "'Advertising' Higher Education: The Early Years of College Public Relations." Muller's winning article, "Restructuring the University," had appeared in the Fall, 1969, issue and stressed the importance of considering all elements of the university—including the nonacademic employees and the alumni—in efforts to change the university structure.[44]

The perennial move to change ACPRA's name surfaced again in 1970-71. In its first meeting on July 9, 1970, the Board of Trustees for the new year decided that the name change should again be considered by the trustees and membership. At its next meeting the board voted to send to all voting representatives in the member institutions a letter noting that a change had been proposed and asking how interested they would be in a change. At the final meeting of the 1970-71 board in Washington, Robert G. Waldo, who had contacted voting representatives, reported that 251 had replied with approximately two-thirds favoring a change. In addition, more than 100 possible names had been suggested by the respondents. The trustees, however, decided to table action on a name change pending further action on related matters (the AAC-ACPRA study especially).[45]

Budget trouble among colleges and universities threatened to cause a drop in membership early in 1970-71. But by year's end in August, 1971, the number of institutional members had grown to a new high of 1,267 and that of member representatives to more than 3,800. Meanwhile, the trustees had decided that dues, unchanged since 1964-65, should continue at the current level through 1971-72.[46]

The Board of Trustees had budgeted $327,000 for 1970-71 and the Executive Committee later projected budgets of $373,000 and $391,000 for 1971-72 and 1972-73, respectively.[47] Income and expenses both, however, went far beyond the budgeted figure for 1970-71, the former standing at $467,437, and the latter at $412,646. Income from special programs and projects had more than doubled to reach $54,089, while that from publications, educational conferences, and membership fees had also shown healthy increases. Net worth of the Association now stood at $355,559, the first time it had gone above $300,000.[48]

As a concluding feature of the Washington Assembly, the Board of Trustees elected officers for 1971-72, advancing James W. Frick of the University of Notre Dame to the presidency and naming Robert G. Waldo of the University of Washington and Robert Lynch of the University of Florida as president-elect and secretary, respectively. Named to serve on the Executive Committee with the officers and Dittman as past president were Lee O. Case of Occidental College, Travis Cross of the University of California, and David S. Thompson of Princeton University.[49]

In his addresses throughout the year President Dittman had emphasized his belief that members of ACPRA needed to devote more time to self-education and self-improvement. "A noticeable edge," he said, "goes to those who have the determination and the drive to continue graduate work for advanced degrees. . . . There is another thing which I believe distinguishes the successful worker in our field from the mediocre. The most successful people bring not only competence and character and broad-gauged attitude, but they have a distinct commitment to the process of education and usually—sooner or later—they establish a deep commitment to a particular college or university."

Dittman said that attitude was especially crucial "to our fulfillment as individuals and to the success of our educational system and ultimately to our society."

"I believe that the most important change to work for is a change in the attitude of frustration, of disillusionment—even despair—which so generally identifies with either the written or spoken word concerning higher education. There are those who blame the conditions of our colleges on federal and state government for a host of errors of omission and commission; there are those who blame students, or better still their parents; there are those who blame the faculty (those 'idle intellectuals'), or the administration, or the trustees; and surely there is no one in this room who hasn't blamed the local and national press, radio, and television for the problems of our colleges and universities.

"Isn't it wonderful that only we are not to blame?

"If each day we could identify one inspiring student or project on our campus—and we all know that we have barely scratched the surface in this—and if each of us could make *one* gesture of telling our associates and the outside world about it, countless little ripples of confidence, enthusiasm, and faith would surely move out into the broader community and just might turn the tidal wave of rejection. Ralph Waldo Emerson's confident declaration is one I try to keep before me:

" 'This time, like all times, is a very good one, if we but know what to do with it'.

"May we together find new attitudes of faith and confidence to go with these good times."[50]

Examination And Anticipation

Jim Frick, ACPRA's last elected president, is probably the only university development officer ever to turn down a gift of $250,000. He did just that during an important capital fund drive at the University of Notre Dame—and got double that amount for his audacity.

The donor was a wealthy trustee, former president of Notre Dame's Alumni Association, and a leader in a current campaign. After thinking through his commitment, he went to Frick's office and announced his intention to give the quarter million. To his astonishment, Frick replied: "Harry [that was not his name], I can't take it."

"What do you mean, you can't take it?" Harry demanded, his astonishment and indignation apparent.

Frick explained that it was not enough, that other potential benefactors would gauge their gifts by what Harry had done, that as a leader of the program he had to give $500,000.

"Well," said James Murphy, Frick's longtime associate, in telling the story, "Harry stomped out of the office but returned a few days later to make the $500,000 commitment. The point is, Jim knew his man and felt he could run the risk of alienating him. I think that gives you some insight into Jim's personality, judgment, and effectiveness."

After two decades at Notre Dame, Frick's achievements as vice president for public relations and development, directing the efforts of twenty-two professionals and some fifty clerical workers, had become almost legendary. In the decade before his election to the ACPRA presidency the Indiana institution had generated approximately $118 million in gifts and grants. According to Murphy, Frick was personally involved in securing a great majority of them.

"Jim is one of the most effective people I know," Murphy commented. "He brings the same drive and decisiveness to whatever he undertakes whether it be as vice president of the university, president of ACPRA, or chairman of the executive committee of the board of the local St. Joseph Bank and Trust Company."[51]

As ACPRA's president Frick demonstrated from his first session in the chair that he was "a take-charge guy" who expected the Association to drive ahead in the achievement of expanded goals and services. In addition to the Association's established programs and its continuing, and hopefully productive, cooperative effort with the AAC, he suggested four areas of emphasis for 1971-72: (1) establishment of a Public Affairs Committee; (2) administrative title changes; (3) certification of public relations and development personnel; and (4) use of trustees in a consulting capacity.[52]

Members both of the Association and of Congress at the Washington Assembly had said that ACPRA needed to involve itself more in the political aspects of federal and state relations as they affected higher education. Practitioners in the emerging field of educational liaison had indicated a desire for a loose organization of persons with a common interest. Congressmen had stressed their need for feedback from institutions and individuals on key issues. The proposed Public Affairs Committee, Frick asserted, would not act as a lobbying force but could offer leadership to members of the Association in the area of Congressional and legislative liaison.

The Board of Trustees approved Frick's nomination of Edwin M. Crawford, vice president for public affairs at the University of Virginia, to head the new committee and proceed with formation of a nationwide group. At the trustees' December meeting Crawford reported that a steering committee had met November 10, called a meeting of the entire committee on December 12 in Atlanta, and discussed possible areas of activity. Information exchanges, meetings of public affairs personnel with presidents during annual conventions of such organizations as the Association of American Universities, Association of American Colleges, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and more programs like the Capitol Hill Day of the recent Washington Assembly, were among the planned activities.[53]

By January, Crawford, who had been elected to ACPRA's Executive Committee in December to replace Travis Cross, resigned, was able to report that his committee now included forty-two individuals from twenty-nine states. Soon to become one of the Association's most active and productive committees, the group had elected an eight-man Executive Council comprised of Edward J. Boling, University of Tennessee; John L. Callahan, Amherst College; George W. Carrick, University of North Florida; John O. Dean, University of Oklahoma; Robert E. McCarthy, Marquette University; Lyle M. Nelson, Stanford University; Rudolph Pate, North Carolina State University, and Crawford.[54]

In July, 1972, Crawford announced that his committee had been enlarged to about 100 individuals; that a three-day conference on state and federal relations programs had been sponsored in Atlanta with subsequent publication of several papers in ACPRA periodicals; that a late May meeting had been held in Washington to discuss tax proposals and higher education bills with key Congressmen; and that the Association of American Universities planned a study of the public affairs and federal relations functions.[55]

Meanwhile, both *College and University Journal* and *Techniques* had, through Crawford's efforts, concentrated on government relations through special sections in their May and June issues, respectively.

During his presidency in 1969, Mike Radock had suggested that a study be made of the ACPRA presidency. Now Frick went further. Other educational associations, he said, were giving their paid executive officers the title of president and their top elected officer the title of chairman of the

Board of Trustees. He consequently suggested that ACPRA follow this pattern. This meant that the present executive vice president, John W. Leslie, would become president and that future elected officers would include a chairman and chairman-elect of the Board of Trustees. In March, it was announced that the membership, by a vote of 635 to 48, had approved the necessary bylaw changes and that the new titles would be used with the beginning of the next fiscal year on September 1, 1972.[56]

Joyce Agnew of the University of Cincinnati was named chairman of a committee to investigate the full implications of Frick's proposal that the Association adopt a certification system. After consultations with members of ACPRA who also held membership in the Public Relations Society of America, which had had a certification system since 1964, it was decided that certification for ACPRA would be difficult because membership was on an institutional rather than an individual basis. The move for certification was consequently abandoned.[57]

The involvement of trustees in a consulting capacity had been suggested by Frick largely as a means for assisting community and small colleges, whether they were ACPRA members or not. As the plan developed, the advisory group also included past presidents and called for each adviser to give two days a year at nominal cost, one day to visit the advisee institution, the other to consult on his own campus with a representative of the institution being served. The service was also a facet of ACPRA's cooperative efforts that year with the American Association of Junior Colleges, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Cooperative College Development Program, and the Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges.[58]

By this time it was evident that community colleges not only needed special help from ACPRA in establishing public relations and development programs but also offered a large opportunity for membership recruitment. As a result, the Board of Trustees voted to provide full-time staff support for a program of increased services to and membership recruitment of two-year colleges; voted to create and budget for a Committee on Expanded Services for Two-Year Colleges; and authorized the national office, working in conjunction with officials of the American Association of Junior Colleges, to seek financial support from foundations to implement needed services. It also approved plans of the Great Lakes District to hold a three-day pilot program stressing greater involvement with community colleges. The project was to be underwritten by $1,000 from the district and a matching grant from either ACPRA or AAJC.[59]

Frick named Lowell J. Erickson of the Metropolitan Junior College District in Kansas City as chairman of the newly-authorized committee which began functioning in December. Its activities resulted in greater attention to problems of two-year colleges at district meetings, establishment of a public relations council by AAJC, a full range of sessions for community college registrants on the 1972 national conference program, and a study of advancement programs among two-year institutions which was started but still imcomplete at year's end.[60]

In assuming office, Frick took steps which led to several new or expanded services. But his major interest, like that of his recent predecessors, was focused on progress toward the unification of ACPRA and AAC. After Chancellor Wells had accepted the invitation of AAC and ACPRA to serve as chairman of a joint study commission "to determine the future mission of the two organizations," Frick announced that Joseph J. Adams, assistant dean of the University of Oregon Medical School; Michael Radock, vice president for university relations and development of the University of Michigan, and David Thompson, assistant to the president at Princeton, would be ACPRA's commission members. AAC meanwhile named Robert E. Linson, director of alumni relations and executive director of the alumni association of Ball State University; Robert B. Rennebohm, executive director of the University of Wisconsin Foundation, and Robert Rhodes, editor of the *Brown Alumni Monthly*, as its representatives.[61]

The joint study group, known as the Wells Commission, held its first meeting in Washington on December 2, 1971. Because of his many years in the education field and his familiarity with the work of both organizations, Wells had been asked to give his informal opinion concerning their unification. He chose not to make specific recommendations but did say that the concept of unification ought to be pursued and suggested "federation of the two bodies so that your resources may be used with maximum efficiency."[62]

The commission decided that the two organizations should submit separate plans for the future. The study group would analyze both plans, make modifications, additions, and deletions as deemed best, then present recommendations to the boards of the two associations. Wells suggested that the document from each organization should include: (1) a preamble of objectives to be achieved by reorganization; (2) the outline of a plan to reach objectives; (3) advantages and disadvantages of the plan; (4) organizational structure to be utilized; and (5) a timetable for implementing the plan.[63]

ACPRA's Board of Trustees later on December 2 discussed the Wells Commission report at length, finally voted acceptance of its recommendations, and gave the national office staff the task of preparing the Association's proposal. A minority of the board was so pessimistic that the following day Frick made a strong statement as the trustees were about to adjourn.

"I am concerned," he declared, "about certain facets of the discussion yesterday regarding the ACPRA-AAC affair. . . . There is no way any of us can predict the outcome of this effort. But we must make it without reservation or prejudice. . . . There comes a time when faith and trust must be demonstrated, as well as the practical aspects of checks and balances. . . . I think we have to approach this matter positively, with some optimism and enthusiasm. Nothing less is worthy of this group. I think history will judge us very harshly if we do not seize this opportunity to better serve our memberships and higher education."[64]

The plans and statements which staffs of the two organizations had been assigned to draw were completed, approved by their respective boards, and ready for consideration by the full commission by mid-March. Both plans indicated support for unification.

"A new organization made up of members of the present American Alumni Council and the present American College Public Relations Association would broaden both the stated purposes and the membership of these two existing organizations," the AAC plan said in its opening sentence. "The opportunity would exist for such an organization *to promote the understanding of education and the support of education* among all the publics served; the opportunity would also exist to involve in the membership those individuals who must understand, promote, and support education. What would result would be : (1) a force for the advancement and support of education, and (2) a gathering and disseminating agency of professional knowledge in the areas of communication, financial support, constituency relations, and administrative management."[65]

The twelve-page plan presented by ACPRA was conceptual, while AAC's eight-page plan was structural. The former outlined five purposes for the suggested organization, then sketched fifteen functions through which the objectives could be achieved. The five purposes suggested were: (1) to address itself to the advancement of understanding and support of higher education at the national level; (2) to help interpret to the public the goals and methods of higher education and to communicate its needs; (3) to communicate to educators, and to interpret for them, the attitudes and expectations of the public with regard to education; (4) to become involved in the fashioning of a national policy for support of higher education and to develop instruments that would assure sustained cooperation and communication among higher education organizations; and (5) to improve the performance of institutional advancement program personnel and to encourage and provide for their continued professional growth."[66]

The AAC plan detailed organization for the united group including leadership structure, a proposed Congress of Volunteers, an Administrative Senate, and staff structure, items not offered by the ACPRA plan. AAC also suggested, as ACPRA did not, a possible timetable for achieving the new association. The timetable suggested January, 1974, as the date for "full implementation of the new association."[67]

The Wells Commission, holding its final meeting in Chicago on June 21, 1972, agreed that the objectives outlined in the plans from AAC and ACPRA "appeared to be identical" and that "there seemed to be no serious differences or obstacles presented in the proposed merger or federation." There was a consensus that the commission should recommend a federation rather than a merger of the two associations but there was also general agreement that "the development of the federation must be accomplished in carefully-planned steps, keeping in mind the various interests of all of the special interest groups involved."

Asked if he thought outside consultants might be useful, Wells responded that "if the commission members felt they had come far enough in this one thing, the two organizations might be able to do the job. If not, then an outside crutch might be used."

"If we really want to do this thing, we can," he declared, "and we really should go ahead and do it. Begin with the infant," he advised, "and let him grow up a bit allowing unresolved areas to be taken care of by time."[68]

Shortly after this meeting, Wells wrote the trustees of the two associations and also Robert Rhodes and Michael Radock, who had served as leaders on the commisssion, emphasizing the importance of unification as he saw it.

"It is impossible," he wrote, "to overestimate the importance of the role to be played in the critical period just ahead by the American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Association. There is widespread misunderstanding of the role and function of colleges and universities in our society. This misunderstanding seems to be growing notwithstanding past efforts to enlighten the public. Higher education seems to be in danger of having its future determined by those who know little about it, the instant experts of mass media, the professional management organizations, and the emotional pressure groups.

"I am sure that the members of your respective associations are fully aware of these facts and are attempting to find ways and means to improve your effectiveness in the future. Certainly one of the means which needs exploration is the federation of the two bodies so that your resources may be used with maximum efficiency. Neither dollars nor time can be wasted in the period ahead."[69]

In his letters to Rhodes and Radock, Wells emphasized that he must now be relieved of membership on the commission because of the necessity to devote his time in the immediate future to a major writing and research project and a major gifts effort. "I do not believe that any outsider is needed," he wrote. "Once you decide what your groups wish to do, your professional people will know how to do it."[70]

Joseph Adams, who had served as secretary for the commission at its June meeting, next prepared a statement for ACPRA's trustees in which he emphasized nine principles which had guided the commission in its deliberations: "(1) The necessity and desirability of unifying the two organizations into a federation which maintains the identity of constituent elements. (2) The need to be sensitive to the strengths of the present organizations, their histories, and the aspirations and careers of their staffs, and by unification to make an even more important contribution to higher education than has been true in the past. (3) The need to gather and disseminate professional knowledge in the areas of communication, financial support, constituency relations, and administrative management. (4) The recognition of the vital role of the two organizations in the recruitment and professionalization of staff personnel to work in support of education. (5) The necessity of becoming involved in the fashioning of a national policy for support of higher education and of developing instruments that would assure sustained cooperation and communication among educational organizations. (6) The recognition of the role of volunteers—those individuals who must understand, promote, and support education—to the organizations and to their memberships. (7) The acknowledgment that regional programs of public communication to strengthen public support and confidence in education are important. (8) The importance of building any national organization on the strengths of the district and regional organization. (9) The desirability of avoiding duplication of effort and of providing the most effective service for the membership at the lowest possible cost."[71]

At its national conference in July, the AAC decided to defer further action on unification until it could conduct a broad-gauge self-study of its organization, hopefully to be completed within six months. At a meeting on July 17 before the opening of the Association's national conference, ACPRA's trustees acted upon four recommendations made by its members on the commission: "(1) That the Board of Trustees approve the concept of unification of ACPRA and AAC. (2) That a joint task force or other groups consisting of members of the ACPRA Board of Trustees, the AAC Board of Directors, and the staffs of both AAC and ACPRA be appointed by the respective chairman of each board to study various aspects of the relationship, and to draft a blueprint along with a timetable to achieve unification. (3) That this blueprint be consistent with the principles previously set forth [in Adams' statement to the trustees following the commission meeting of June 21]; that the document conform to all legal and other requirements; that the report be approved by the governing bodies of both associations, and that it then be submitted to the memberships of both organizations. (4) That ratification of the final report should be sought from the memberships of each organization at the earliest feasible date."

The board accepted the recommendation that it approve the concept of unification for the two organizations and adopted in principle the other three recommendations. Final action was to be contingent upon ACC's decision following its self-study. The feeling of pessimism that had cast a shadow over earlier discussions now seemed to have disappeared and substantive developments during the next year were being anticipated eagerly and with optimism.[72]

The subject of management was receiving increased attention from ACPRA each year and in November, 1971, the Association devoted the entire *College and University Journal* to a comprehensive report on the research of Executive Vice President John Leslie. In the introduction to "Seeking the Competitive Dollar: College Management in the Seventies," a study of 169 institutional programs made possible by the grant received from the Esso Education Foundation in 1970, Leslie emphasized that astute educators, by the beginning of the seventies, had become acutely aware of three conditions: "(1) In the public eye, the image of higher education had become tarnished. (2) Financially, some of our colleges and universities were in such economic straits that there was serious question whether they could survive. . . . (3) The ordinary way of 'doing things', of managing our institutions, was no longer adequate—either for the given task or for the time left in which to complete the task." His monograph, he added, did not offer a panacea for the solution of problems facing institutions but was rather an attempt "to stimulate thought and action that will lead to more effective, more economical institutional advancement programs.

"Academic traditionalism, responsibility without commensurate authority, inadequate governing boards, and untrained leadership have taken their toll among our colleges and universities," Leslie continued, "but nowhere have the problems been more compounded than in management of the institution. Such a statement in no way denies the accomplishments of the countless individuals who guided American higher education through remarkable growth periods in the late forties and the sixties. But to resort to the favorite Washington habit of sports metaphors, 'We're in a new ball game in a different park'. . . . Three imperatives seem clear for college management in the immediate future: (1) the need to program, plan, and build in flexibility; (2) the need to implement new management approaches and techniques, and (3) the need to develop, on a nationwide basis, an educational management academy for the continuing and systematic training of college administrators."

In Leslie's opinion, "the imperative which would have the greatest long-range benefit to higher education would be the development of an educational management academy." Such an academy—with a core faculty augmented by expert practitioners as resource personnel—would, he believed, overcome most of the limitations of the conference/workshop system in vogue in recent years.

"If institutions," he declared, "would incorporate flexibility as a way of life, adopt and implement existing management techniques that have proved successful in government and industry, and subscribe to an educational management academy supplemented by a systematic on-the-job training program, there seems little doubt that they could survive and even prosper in what appears will be an alien climate of the seventies."[73]

With tables, Leslie presented figures which emphasized: (1) that institutions were allocating a decreasing proportion of their educational and general expenditures to institutional advancement programs; (2) that, with a few exceptions, the cost of raising private gift dollars had increased substantially in the past decade; (3) that, in most institutions, gift income was providing a smaller percentage of the total needed to operate these institutions; (4) that the size of professional staffs for advancement programs had increased only slightly since 1967-68; (5) that the larger an institution's gift income and advancement program expenditures were, the less it tended to spend proportionately on salaries of staff; (6) that, while the size of institutional advancement program (IAP) professional staffs had continued to increase steadily during the past four years, salaries had tended to make only modest gains.

Included in Leslie's study was a section on "Programming Effective Communication and Financial Support" in which he diagrammed staff organizations for large and small institutions, enumerated steps for systematic program planning, and presented descriptions of broad objectives of the various elements in an institutional advancement program. The nine steps suggested for a program flow chart were: (1) Identify broad objectives and policies for the IAP. (2) Define relevant trends which might affect the program. (3) Identify specific communications and financial support activities and group them into program elements. (4) Determine the basic approach and designate the administrator for each activity within the program elements. (5) Designate a director for each program element. (6) Establish objectives of various program elements. (7) Review and revise various activities to conform to objectives of their respective program elements. (8) Develop revised plans for each activity with program elements. (9) Establish a control system.[74]

"Successful management," Leslie wrote, "is a process of controls—stopping, starting, revising programs and activities as judgment dictates from an analysis of progress against desired objectives. But the keys to a functioning control system are accurate information and descriptive accounting procedures."

Leslie concluded his monograph on management with a section on "The Philosophy Underlying an Institutional Advancement Program." "The institutional advancement program," he wrote, "provides the formal mechanism which ensures proper utilization of the talents of faculty, administration, and all other persons closely involved in activities designed to advance the understanding and support of the institution. The IAP must be much more than a professional staff and a set of offices. It is a concept, an attitude, which must pervade the entire institutional family. It is faculty members and deans seeking funds for special projects, programs, or equipment. It is internal understanding of and agreement on the institution's mission. It is a system which establishes an orderly pursuit of priorities, but which is also designed to stimulate individual initiative and creativity. It is a philosophy of operating in the public interest, for inevitably institutions exist only with the consent of the public. . . .

"Without clearly defined, agreed-upon institutional long-range objectives, chief executive officers and governing boards are, for the most part, wasting communication and financial support efforts—not to mention efforts in other academic and administrative areas. If there is no institutional plan, or if that plan is vague and ill-defined, inevitably the objectives of the advancement program become extremely short term, tending to focus on funding a project, staging an annual special event, or just raising money and sending out news releases. If there is no institutional plan, measurements of effectiveness are made solely on management's tools—the event, the release, the publication—rather than on management's accomplishment of institutional objectives. . . .

"The purpose of the plan is to establish communication patterns, decision-making levels, and control procedures. To be effective, management must communicate its policies well and quickly, establish responsibility and authority, and be consistent in its policy interpretation. The lower the level at which a decision can be made, the more time administration and managers will conserve. Likewise, pinning responsibility and necessary authority at the proper place will increase both effectiveness and efficiency. With more information and insight, every member of the institutional family will perform his own function better and will truly be a member of the institutional advancement team."[75]

In 1971-72 ACPRA also sponsored two special conferences on "Managing the Development Program," the first in New Orleans and the second in Washington. Both conferences, held in January and using the same faculty, concentrated on the application of the latest management techniques to educational advancement programs.[76]

Because of the growing interest in management facets of advancement programs, the United States Steel Foundation later in January responded to the Association's proposal for aid by making a $30,000 grant. This fund would support a three-phased program to further the development and maintenance of effective institutional advancement programs. Refinement of current evaluation procedures to provide guidelines for college executive officers and governing boards would be the first objective. The second phase of the program would concentrate on seminars for college management teams—presidents and chief academic and business officers as well as public relations and development managers. The third step, expected before the end of 1973, would be the development of appropriate ways to provide recognition for well-managed institutional advancement programs.[77]

Management also received attention at most of the district conferences held during the year with total attendance approaching 1,800. Although President Frick's normal travel schedule for Notre Dame took him in the neighborhood of 100,000 to 150,000 miles a year, he also made room for attendance and speaking at most of the district meetings held during the first six months of his presidency. In every case he presented the message, "Building Meaning into Your Life," meant to give inspiration to members, especially those comparatively new to the field.[78]

"Whether we are the youngest or newest member of the staff, or head of an organization of fifty or more people, we must broaden and deepen our professional competence through a program of self-education," Frick asserted. "For the most part, self-education will not be forced upon us. It must be voluntary; it must stem from a commitment which you make to yourself, to make yourself a better professional through constant reading, attendance at workshops and seminars, visits to other campuses, and continuing discourse with public relations and development people in *and* out of higher education. . . .

"I am also convinced that many of us, perhaps most of us, should consider more formal education, even to studying for the doctorate. Seeking a doctoral degree is particularly important, I believe, for any of you who aspires to become a vice president or president of a college or university. . . . When you become the vice president for public relations or development or its equivalent for an institution, you are an officer of that university and will be involved in decisions of importance which have little if anything to do with public relations and development as such. You must wrestle intellectually on issues of import with the president, the other vice presidents and deans, and trustees. As an officer, you are similar to a senator. You are concerned with your 'state', public relations and development, but you are also concerned with and responsible for the total 'country', your institution. . . . I am convinced that not many years hence an advanced degree will be a prerequisite for any meaningful role on a university campus."

Frick urged members of each audience to determine the extent of their commitment to the field of college public relations and development.

"One of the things I have observed for a long time," he said, "is the great mobility of people in this profession. . . . Too often I see people in this Association who bounce from one campus to another, starting a program here and there, never seeing it through, only to land at another institution with a larger salary, a more impressive title, without really having proven anything to themselves or the institution. I realize that early in a career it may be good to make a couple of moves, to broaden our experience. But there comes a time, sooner or later, when I think we must decide, as Brigham Young, leader of the Mormons, did when he arrived at the Great Salt Lake Valley: 'This is the place!' "

Frick told his listeners that, even though they might be fairly well settled at their institutions, they should make plans for their future progress there—determine where in the organization they were presently, where they wanted to be, what steps were needed to get there.

"Just as you plan institutional programs, I am convinced you must plan your own personal program for progress," he declared. "No one is going to make you do it; no one is going to do it for you. But without a plan, without a program, without a timetable, you will drift like a piece of flotsam, touching a beach here, a breakwater there, but never making much of an impact anywhere, and without really knowing the direction in which you're moving. . . .

"The future of our profession, the future of our colleges and universities to a substantial degree, certainly the future of ACPRA, depends on the caliber of you and others like you. And to a large extent your future and the future of your family depend on the sacrifices you make, the effort you expend, to become a professional in every sense of the word. But it takes commitment, deep commitment. You must want to get there. . . . And you can get where you want to go if you're willing to do a lot of thinking and planning and improving yourself, mostly through sheer hard work. If you do this, you can make an effective contribution to your own welfare, to the welfare of your family, your institution, to higher education, and to the country."

Frick's travels to speak at district meetings were not without hardship. In early February, 1972, for instance, he was caught in Seattle without a whit or tittle of life's traveling necessities. The Northwest Orient flight he boarded in Chicago was destined for Tokyo, with almost all the passengers going there for the Olympics. The baggage crew didn't take Frick's bag from the plane in Seattle so it went on to Tokyo with the Olympics fans. Northwest Orient called Tokyo and had the bag retained on the plane for the return trip to Seattle. Meanwhile, Frick had bought a ditty bag, a change of underwear, and a new shirt, addressed the Northwest District meeting, done a little work in his hotel room, and gone to bed. His plane for Chicago and South Bend was leaving at 11:30 a.m. next day and the return plane from Tokyo arrived at 11:10.

Frick snatched his much-traveled bag from the baggage rack at 11:25, ran to United Airlines, checked it in, then ran down the corridor to the gate and boarded the plane for South Bend.

The pace finally put Frick in the hospital. Arriving in Pinehurst, North Carolina, late on February 27, he checked into a freshly painted room. About 4 a.m. he awoke with terrible chest pains. Allergic to leaded paint, he assumed his discomfort resulted from the paint used in his room. He dressed, went outside, lay down on a grassy knoll, and slept fitfully until dawn, then went in for a cup of coffee. Because he now felt better, Frick was sure his problem had merely been the paint allergy. But three days later, back in South Bend, he collapsed from a massive heart attack that incapacitated him for six months.[79]

Three of ACPRA's publications, *College and University Journal, Newsletter,* and *Techniques,* took on a new look in 1971-72 and a new one, *The Occasional Ficherman,* was added. Making use of materials available through the Association's new Creative Publications Service, now operating with nearly 200 subscribers, editor Robert R. Hesse converted the *Journal* into a more colorful, more readable magazine after taking over January 1. New type faces and restyled makeup, as well as more innovative graphics, helped in the conversion. Photographs, graphics and a new format brightened *Techniques,* also edited by Hesse.

The year was one of experimentation with the *Newsletter* which had been published in the traditional 8½ × 11-inch format since 1961 with only occasional deviations for special occasions. Starting in January, 1972, the name was changed to *ACPRA News* and a unique five-page format adopted. In April, still bearing the name *ACPRA News,* the newsletter became a four-page insert of the bimonthly *Techniques.*

In May, 1972, Cletis Pride produced the first issue of his "occasional newsletter," *The Occasional Ficherman,* devoted to information about ACPRA's microfiche library created when the Association decided to produce Info-Kits as a program of the new Research-Reference Center. By May Pride was able to announce that twenty-eight Info-Kits had been produced in fiche and hard cover.

The September, 1971, issue of the *Journal,* edited after the departure of Brent Beedin and before the arrival of Hesse, featured an article, "A President Looks at Development," written by W. Noel Johnston, ACPRA's executive director from 1956 to 1959 and now president of Ohio's Defiance College. Johnston devoted most of the article to elaboration on a list of twelve requirements for a good development officer.[80]

"First of all," he said, "I want a man who can get along with me. Included in that broad qualification is *loyalty to me and to the institution.* He must *believe in me and let me know it.* He must *perceive the institution and its goals in the same general way I perceive them.* . . .The compatibility of the president and the development officer is absolutely essential. They don't have to like each other—although that helps—but they must respect one another and they must trust one another. They must pull together. They are a special team within a team. I want a development officer who can tell me the truth—even if it is that my breath is bad."

Johnston said that the development officer he wanted must also be creative, imaginative, optimistic, adaptable, tactful, and selfless and have courage and integrity, judgment, respect for scholarship, scope, and personality.

"Higher education is no place for cowards," Johnston asserted. "We need men who will stand with the college on *its* principles and interpret the college honestly, even when the money seems to be in jeopardy. More often than not the money will not be lost. People respect institutional and personal integrity."

Johnston said, in discussing imagination, that his biggest frustration as a president was the tendency of so many people to come to him for solutions in their own fields of expertise. "We need development people," he declared, "who will come to the president with ideas, plans, and dreams; who will come for an okay or for cooperation; who will come for comment but not for ideas! . . . In these tight money times, it is especially important to find development officers who will not rely on the single idea of more staff to solve problems."

Optimism is essential in a development officer, in Johnston's opinion, because "No one is more easily depressed than a donor." "If you think the students have gone to hell, the faculty doesn't care, and the old school is on its last legs, *get out!* The center for faith in the institution must be the development officer.

"The president," Johnston concluded, "wants this paragon of virtue that I've described for you, but he wants him not only because he wants to associate with such a sterling character. He wants expert analysis, competent planning, and good execution of a fund-raising and public relations program."

Joseph Adams, an ACPRA trustee and assistant dean at the University of Oregon Medical School, warned in a *Journal* article that more and more Americans had been undergoing a kind of mass brainwashing and that ACPRA members, "above all others on or off the campus, should have an understanding of human nature and the forces at work in our society which have an impact on the way people feel, the way they think, and the way they act."[81]

"We in higher education today are faced with so many serious problems we hardly know where to begin," he said. "We have disruptive students, disgruntled faculty, distraught parents, discouraged administrators, disturbed alumni, disenchanted publics, and finally disappearing dollars. . . .

"Most would agree there has been a breakdown of law and order of massive proportions in this nation. The ethical codes of our Christian-Judaic heritage are being replaced by a so-called new morality—which is the same old immorality of yesteryear. Self-discipline in this age has become a dirty word. Individuality is suppressed and replaced by group action; decision making is diffused; there is a fleeing from responsibility and authority. We live in a time when nonnorms are now the norms; when the minority rules the majority; when wrong has become right; when evil is good and good is evil; when A equals B; when war is peace; when freedom is slavery; when ignorance is strength. . . .

"For almost twenty years in America, more and more people have been undergoing a kind of mass brainwashing conducted through our educational system and at many levels in our government, in our churches and corporations—in fact, in almost all areas of society. It goes under a variety of names: encounter groups, T-groups, group analysis, personal and family emotional development, group confession, group dynamics, autocriticism, operant conditioning, self-examination, interpersonal relations or self-evaluation, nude therapy, role playing, and a host of others. They serve as a cover for the broad term 'sensitivity training'. . . .

"Perhaps if we could accept the fact that the principles of brainwashing, of thought control, have been applied to all levels of an unsuspecting public, it might be easier to understand what has been happening on our campuses, and in America. It also might give us a clue as to why we in higher education, especially, have been so slow to respond to the attacks being made upon us.

"As university and alumni relations officers, we will have to know our institutions far better than ever before. We will have to probe for answers on our campuses of how we do things, why we do them, and suggest better ways to do old things, and new ways to do new things. In other words, let's be innovative and learn to do more things better with fewer dollars. We will have to serve as the conscience of our institutions, because our institutions in many instances have acted in an unconscionable way."

Public relations, fund raising, and alumni operations had been caught in higher education's financial crunch. The situation was explored in the same issue of the *Journal* by a new survey conducted by the Association's Research-Reference Center. After a random sampling of 138 institutions, Cletis Pride reported that " 'austerity' seems to be the password for most institutional advancement operations, just as it is for much of the higher education community."[82]

Thirty-seven of the institutions were operating with reduced or unchanged educational and general budgets in 1971-72 and only thirty-eight advancement program officers felt their budgets were generally better than the year before. The size of advancement program staffs had been reduced at thirty-six institutions and was unchanged at sixty-nine. Increases, when made, had usually been in the fund-raising area. Salaries for advancement staffs had been reduced in three institutions and remained unchanged in twenty-eight. Budgets for membership in professional organizations and those for travel had also been hard hit.

Pride's findings from his random sampling were similar to those revealed in a survey he had made among Association trustees, eighteen of whom had reported that the current financial squeeze had affected their operations. In this survey trustees had reported budget cutting had included "trimming anything that could be done without," restricting mailings, curtailing long-distance calls, and taking a closer look at operational expenditures generally. Most of the trustees anticipated little change in financial support for their institutions and nearly a third of them anticipated gains in this area, especially among alumni. Student unrest of recent years had been replaced, the trustees believed, by student concerns over the cost of higher education, quality of teaching, the environment, and opportunities of the future.

Still another of the year's contributions from the Research-Reference Center was completion of a comprehensive bibliography edited by Pride. The 404-page book, *Securing Support for Higher Education: A Bibliographical Handbook*, included more than 1,700 computerized listings of books, articles, case studies, and other materials that had been published in the areas of collegiate public relations, development, alumni affairs, and government relations.[83]

ACPRA's Publications Leadership Program became the National Communications Competition in 1972 when electronic media were included for the first time. Pennsylvania State University received the certificate of exceptional achievement and IBM incentive grant of $500 in competition with 132 entries in the electronics division. Twenty-six other institutions received special citations. In the publications category, the certificate of exceptional achievement and $500 IBM grant went to Lehigh University.

In the National Honors Competition, recognizing significant achievement in public relations and development, certificates of exceptional achievement and $500 grants went to Duke University, Frostburg (Maryland) State College, and University of Redlands. Special citations were awarded to seventeen institutions.[84]

James M. Shea, vice president for university relations at Temple University, was announced as the winner of *College and University Journal's* fourth (and final) Distinguished Article Award of $500, again made possible by a grant from Frantzreb and Pray Associates of New York City. His winning article on "Metamorphosis in College PR," discussing possible effects of campus terriorism, labor movements, sexual equality, race relations, the financial crunch, and "the emotional estrangement of higher education from the rest of the citizenry," had appeared as the feature article in the March, 1971, issue of the *Journal*.

Frederick D. Patterson, former director of the United Negro College Fund and the Phelps-Stokes Fund and now president of the Robert R. Moton Memorial Foundation, received ACPRA's award for distinguished service to higher education at the national conference in Minneapolis. M. M. Chambers, who had edited the Association's bimonthly legislative publication, *Grapevine*, since its beginning in 1962 and was now about to retire as professor of higher education at Illinois State University, was awarded the Association's presidential citation for 1972.[85]

The Association's list of Seasoned Sages was raised to eighty when the Board of Trustees added twenty-five to the roster of those previously honored.[86]

"A Time for Change" was the theme for ACPRA's 1972 national conference held in Minneapolis July 17-19. James Baker, vice president of the College Entrance Examination Board, officiated as chairman and Howard R. Rowland, director of the Office of Information Services and Public Relations at St. Cloud (Minnesota) State College, as coordinator. Some 760 delegates and more than 200 sponsors, exhibitors, and guest speakers were on hand for a program covering virtually every area of interest. Special meetings were held for members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and

Universities, and the Association of American Colleges, and six hours were allotted to community and junior colleges for consideration of their problems.[87]

Delivering the keynote address on "Educational Progress at a Time of Financial Austerity," Howard R. Bowen, chancellor of Claremont University Center, concluded by asserting that "the institution that can use fiscal necessity as an instrument for pruning the unnecessary, and the irrelevant as a device for finding new and better methods of instruction and as a way of achieving new, cooperative relationships with other institutions, and can use the soft labor market as an opportunity for strengthening faculty . . . will emerge in the next decade as a leader."[88]

The Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S. J., president of St. Louis University, spoke at a later general session. He told the delegates that colleges and universities must live within their means, that deficit spending spelled defeat for fund raising, and that a balanced budget was an absolute necessity.

"The current depression in higher education," he said, "is a blessing in disguise in that it has forced institutions to reexamine their reason for being, to reevaluate their purpose, and then to restructure their programs in tune with that underlying philosophy."[89]

Another dimension was added to ACPRA services when all general session addresses, community and junior college programs, and survey research sessions were recorded, then made available on audiocassettes.

The program for ACPRA's School for Administrators, held as usual for two days before the national conference, drew nearly 250 registrants. The program was oriented toward the definition of program objectives methods for achieving them, and ways of evaluating their effectiveness. The Association's other ongoing program, the Summer Academy, now in its sixth year, was held in a new location. The first five had been held at the University of Notre Dame but this year the academy was transferred to the Center of Adult Education at the University of Maryland in order to accommodate individuals in eastern states.[90]

Institutional membership in ACPRA reached 1,300 in May when Morris Brown College in Atlanta, Georgia, joined the Association.[91] By the end of the year the figure had grown to 1,315. Credit was given to the work of a membership liaison committee named by President Frick, made up of trustees serving from each of the nine regions and the two-year college areas.[92] The Associations's budget for 1971-72 had been set at $335,000 originally but was later lowered to $318,000 in anticipation of a financial pinch.[93] However, income from membership fees continued to bring in more than $257,000 while both income and expenditures from communications services and the Research-Reference Center soared far above expectations. As a result, total income for the year jumped to $447,337 and expenditures to $446,731.[94] The $606 margin marked the eighth year the Association had operated in the black. Still, the puny size of the surplus convinced the Executive Committee that deciding to increase fees by 1973-74 had been a wise move.[95]

Because President Frick was still recuperating from his heart attack, he was unable to attend the national conference. Robert G. Waldo, the president-elect soon to become the first chairman of the Board of Trustees as a result of the bylaw revisions, presided at meetings. When the annual election was held, John L. Callahan of Amherst College was named chairman-elect and Robert R. Lynch, Jr., of the University of Florida was continued as secretary. Elected to serve on the Executive Committee with Waldo, Callahan, Lynch, Frick and Leslie, now president by virtue of the bylaw changes, were Joseph J. Brady of Case Western Reserve University, Joseph J. Adams of the University of Oregon Medical School, and Edwin M. Crawford of the University of Virginia, who had been a replacement member on the committee since December.[96]

Although Frick was unable to attend the national conference, or indeed to take an active part in Association affairs in the last five months of his administration, his early planning and the inspiration of the words he had voiced as he assumed the presidency in July, 1971, provided the momentum for one of ACPRA's better years.

"We who are members of ACPRA engaged in public relations and development activities are among the most fortunate people in this country," Frick had told his colleagues at the 1971 convention dinner. "What our society is, what it will be, to a very large extent, depends upon our institutions of higher education because from them will flow the leadership our society so desperately needs. And, of course, what our colleges and universities are and what they will be to a substantial degree depends upon the success of our efforts, yours and mine, and our counterparts around the nation. . . . It is our responsibility, on the one hand, to create the climate, to establish the environment through which we can produce the funds for our colleges and universities, and on the other hand we enjoy an association and a participation in the production of ideas for the utilization of these funds. We should be very joyous. We are most fortunate. We have the best of both worlds. . . .

"Our reward primarily will never be monetary. Rather, our reward will derive from the knowledge that the endeavor we are engaged in is eminently worthwhile; that we have our finger on the making of the society of the future; that our influence is proportionately far greater than the impact of a news release, a publication, a special event, a campaign. Yes, indeed, our reward is the knowledge that, dependent upon the quality of our work, this world will be a little better for our having been here.[97]

Progress Toward Unification

Although the consideration of merger or federation with the American Alumni Council promised to be of greatest importance for ACPRA during 1972-73, discussion was held in abeyance during the first six months of the year while AAC made a membership survey. Meanwhile, ACPRA's Executive Committee at its fall meeting reviewed the Association's mission and the mission of the national office, and approved objectives for the year.

Saying that a periodic review of mission is always beneficial, President Leslie distributed a two-page statement introduced by a paragraph from the Association's Articles of Organization: "In carrying out its stated objectives and purposes, the Association shall seek to assist its members in their efforts to improve their relations with the varied constituencies which they serve and to which they are responsible as institutions of higher education. In so doing, the Association shall be concerned with all facets of its members' relations both within their respective internal organizations and within the larger communities which they serve. The Association shall not perform the separate functions of its members, but shall provide the mechanism through which each member may improve its own efforts to advance understanding and support for its educational program."

Leslie's statement put clearly in writing what the national office was intended to do: "(1) maintain a central focal point for the conduct of Association activities and programs; (2) assist in the interpretation of goals and objectives of higher education in order to ensure greater public understanding and support of individual colleges and universities; (3) provide a comprehensive program of continuing professional education for persons involved in institutional advancement programs; (4) monitor federal activities in the area of taxation as it affects philanthropy and ensure a constructive dialogue between higher education and the Congress and executive branches."

Leslie's statement also outlined nine specific objectives for 1972-73, most of which were later achieved: "(1) formulate and begin implementation of a program to increase public confidence in higher education; (2) monitor Congressional activities . . . in areas of taxation and philanthropy; develop and implement a program as extensive as deemed necessary should negative legislation be proposed; (3) develop a comprehensive member relations program; (4) inaugurate a communications consultation service; (5) develop special publications in the areas of community relations for junior colleges and public opinion survey for colleges and universities; (6) plan and implement the ongoing activities in the regular Association program areas of educational conferences, communication services, and the Research-Reference Center; (7) formulate and implement a fee increase schedule for 1973-74; (8) secure financing for the Honors Program in 1973; (9) maximize income for 1972-73 and operate within that amount."[98]

The year's efforts to help increase public confidence in higher education were carried out largely through cooperative programs with other educational organizations, the American Council on Education especially. As the year began the Board of Trustees endorsed a program which Robert R. Hesse, the Association's director of communications services, had outlined for joint action by ACPRA and ACE. This program, which hopefully would merit foundation support, called for the identification of goals and objectives of higher education, the determination of public opinion toward higher education, and a communications program to interpret higher education.[99]

"To believe that a single statement of the goals, objectives, and aspirations of all of American higher education can be agreed upon by all may be presumptuous," Hesse had written. "But to believe that there are no common bonds of union within the academic community presumes that it stands for nothing. Certainly somewhere between the two points of view there exists a commonality of purpose which may assume the loftiness of eloquent philosophical statements but also reach to areas which can be articulated, interpreted, studied, and measured; it is these that need to be determined. It should certainly be possible to determine whether or not higher education wishes to be, deserves to be, or indeed is, an independent force shaping the destiny of our nation. And it should not prove too difficult to outline the extent to which it desires to exert its considerable influence."

The Hesse program called for the establishment of a series of objectives once the goals and objectives of higher education had been defined and the results of a nationwide survey of the attitudes of the American public had been analyzed. Among the objectives anticipated were: "(1) to create a climate of understanding and appreciation of the goals of higher education; (2) to articulate the views of higher education; (3) to interpret higher education to the public and the public mind to higher education; (4) to present the advantages of diversity within higher education; (5) to build a case for continued and future support; and (6) to secure, without governmental intrusion, independent and public financial support."

The program also outlined steps in a massive effort of communications and interpretation using all of the legitimate means and media available. ACPRA, it was stated, was willing to assign one of its senior staff members to serve as project director with appropriate accountability to both ACE and ACPRA.

"We can no longer be content to talk to each other," Hesse concluded. He suggested that the two organizations jointly prepare a plan for funding by a foundation to carry forward the proposed program. "The effort must be directed outside—to the mass of the American public and in the language of the people. A systematic network of information exchange, identification of educational spokesmen, the involvement of leading citizens, and a close working relationship with the entire higher education community is called for. It is not unreasonable to expect from all of this effort that a significant impact can and will be made and that higher education will once again become a high national priority and be held in higher esteem by the American people. It is time we regained the initiative and assumed the offensive. The time for action has come and the moment a propitious one."[100]

Later in the year ACPRA prepared a second position paper for ACE, this one offering a more specific plan setting forth immediate, intermediate, and long-range objectives. At year's end President Leslie reported that the two papers had served as the basis of discussion by a small cross section of individuals convened by Roger Heyns, president of ACE, and that an action program was under consideration.[101]

Cooperative efforts aimed at improved public understanding and appreciation were also carried out during the year with three other organizations. One of these efforts was a workshop held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC).[102] The other was a communications institute co-sponsored with the College Entrance Examination Board and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.[103]

The on-again, off-again issue of tax reform as it promised to affect higher education was a major concern of ACPRA's national office and of the Association's Committees on Public Affairs and Taxation and Philanthropy during 1972-73. In addition to keeping close watch on legislative moves affecting higher education, the COTP, again under Roland Matthies of Wittenberg, endeavored to make presidents realize how serious the subject of tax reform could be and cooperated with the national office in maintaining communications with members of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Taxation, however, was merely one area of concern related to the growing role of government in higher education. As a result, the Association augmented its communications efforts with two new publications. Starting in January, ACPRA began to publish a periodic communique in Washington entitled *Dateline Washington*. This four-page tabloid dealt with people, proposals, and events that affected national decisions concerning higher education. Among the topics were fiscal policies, tax reform, public television, new federalism, national priorities, HEW activities, budget proposals and debates, and the Equal Rights Amendment.

The need of college public affairs officers to have source material readily available also led the national office to compile and publish a *Federal Affairs Handbook* whose four sections included a description of the principal federal programs in higher education, a guide to Congress including the membership of committees and subcommittees and staffs dealing with higher education legislation, a collection of sources of information on federal programs, and a glossary of Congressional legislative terms.[104] The book proved even more popular than expected and a second printing had to be made before the end of the year.

Under the auspices of Edwin Crawford's Committee on Public Affairs, a special conference on "Effective Congressional Liaison Programs" was held in Washington for three days starting February 27. The 125 participants heard Congressmen, staff associates, government officials, and education association leaders discuss problems and issues confronting higher education, examined Congressional committees as they affected education, heard case studies of Congressional liaison programs, reviewed the services of national agencies and associations, discussed the funding of educational amendments, tax reform, and developing liaison and information programs. A feature of the conference was a "special tribute luncheon" at which President John Leslie of ACPRA presented plaques to Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, and Representative Carl Perkins of New York, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, in recognition of their leadership in shepherding the 1972 Higher Education Amendments to passage.[105]

ACPRA's Committee on Professional Education, headed by Richard Cheshire of Colgate University, made a thorough study of the educational management academy idea advanced by President Leslie in 1972. The committee recommended that the Association's Board of Trustees "endorse the principle of a new in-service program of advanced study in higher education management; authorize a questionnaire survey to determine interest in such a program among a representative sample of ACPRA members; and authorize the committee to initiate formation of and participate in a joint planning committee comprised of the representatives of professional associations interested in helping to create a consortium which would subsequently work to establish a center for advance study in higher education management."

The committee had learned that several organizations, including ACE, already sponsored brief institutes, conferences, and workshops on educational management and eighty-six universities were offering programs of study in higher education. The committee nevertheless concluded that opportunity for in-service education in higher education management was inadequate.

"The inadequacies are that the opportunities which do exist are generally too brief, or too narrow, or too small (in enrollment capacity), or too basic," the committee reported. "The need is not for another university-sponsored degree program . . . and it is not for introductory studies in higher education management. . . . The need is to provide in-service opportunity for advanced study in higher education management to practicing administrators aspiring to positions as vice president, deans, and directors."

Preliminary conversations had revealed, the committee report indicated, that the executive officers of the American Association for Higher Education, the National Association of College and University Business Officers, and the American Management Association were interested in an advanced study program which would: (1) be the equivalent of a master's degree in course hours; (2) balance general studies with specialized studies, perhaps fifty-fifty; (3) include in its general studies the principles of organization managment and planning, historical, philosophical, and sociological foundations of higher educational policy, and management strategies in academic, student, business, and public affairs; (4) include theory, computer modeling, and case studies as an integral part of the total program; and (5) require a passing grade on a comprehensive examination to obtain a certificate signifying successful completion of the program.[106]

At its meeting in February, 1973, the Board of Trustees authorized the Committee on Professional Education to proceed as outlined in its three recommendations. At the first meeting of the 1973-74 Board of Trustees in July the committee was empowered to conduct a market test of the ACPRA constituency, develop a registrar's function, and secure job descriptions from members of the Board of Trustees as an aid in the committee's initial activities. By that time the merger of AAC and ACPRA had become a certainty and it became the duty of the Committee on Professional Education to work with the ACPRA and AAC programming task forces "to assure a proper transition involving professional education as an area of mutual interest and benefit as merger was being discussed."[107]

The Communications Consultant Service, several years in the planning stage, was launched as a major project of ACPRA early in 1973. Working under Cletis Pride, director of ACPRA's Research-Reference Center, eighteen experts—including the deans of two journalism schools, an education reporter, a producer of educational documentary films, and an authority on visual communications as well as thirteen ACPRA members—offered individual counseling when sought and comprehensive confidential reports on all facets of an institution's communications program with recommendations for improvement.

Also directed by Pride, the microfiche library, now considered one of ACPRA's major services, produced twenty new Info-Kits, covering as many institutional advancement problem areas. The microfiche library also added the 1972 issues of *College and University Journal*, all award-winning case studies in the 1972 National Honors Competition, and all "new look" papers presented at the 1972 national conference. Another microfiche project of the year was a bibliography of college and university advancement subjects for 1971-72. This work, covering 531 books and articles, updated Pride's *Securing Support for Higher Education: A Bibliographical Handbook* which had covered the years 1966 through June 30, 1971.

College and University Journal, now in its twelfth year as "a publication featuring interpretative articles on higher education with special attention to topics of interest to persons in the field of educational advancement," received national recognition "for excellence in educational journalism" in 1973 when it won a distinguished achievement award presented by the Educational Press Association of America.[108]

An old friend of ACPRA was featured in the first issue of the magazine for 1972-73. Editors Robert R. Hesse and William A. McNamara conducted an interview with Edward L. Bernays, pioneer public relations counsel, in his Cambridge, Massachusetts, home.[109] During the conversation, Bernays defined public relations as "that field of action which concerns itself with the relations of an individual, an idea, an institution with the publics upon which it is dependent for its viability." Then he added, "In a democratic society, every idea is competing with every other idea in the marketplace for public knowledge, public interest, and support."

Continuing, Bernays said: "The public relations person must be a professional with the ability to apply an art to a science—in this case, social science. He must first attempt to find out from his principal [the university administration] what the university's objectives are, relative to the various publics; the objectives may vary. In turn, he must advise the administration of the relationship in attitudes and actions that must be developed by the university in order to ensure the viability of its objectives, to say nothing of its own future. . . . In a society that is as competitive as ours in pursuit of the attentions of many publics, the university must focus its collective mind on specific goals in order to survive. . . . Once the institution's objectives emerge from a democratic process of decision making, research ought to be instituted to learn whether the objectives are realistic in the light of the public's present attitudes. Through the application of highly developed principles of mathematics and psychology, it is possible today to evaluate public attitudes on an objective basis."

Bernays said he would like to see ACPRA, perhaps in cooperation with the American Council on Education or the American Association of University Professors, use survey methods and seek some areas of agreement about the goals of higher education in a democratic society.

The editors' final question was: "How can the public relations person be effective in all of this when there is so much skepticism and even cynicism abroad about the role of public relations?" Bernays responded, "I think this can be done only by changing or modifying the climate of opinion surrounding the public relations relationships. And sometimes outside forces have to be brought into play to alter these relationships, to develop parity with individuals or groups that are at the top of the pyramid, viewed by the concerned public.

"Then there are ways of dealing with the future generation of college presidents," Bernays concluded. "There could be a textbook for presidents that would take into account the public relations function. There might be a Harvard managerial school for indoctrination of new presidents with the problem of public relationships. You could have a conference that would work out the patterns of education in keeping with objectives. But, above all, the public relations person has to be put on a parity with a paragon entity. The name of the public relations counsel belongs on the letterhead alongside the name of the president. The public relations person deserves to be seen as the official representative of the institution. Without that person, the institution and its reputation will suffer because relationships with the public are all-important."

The same issue of the *Journal* included "A Special Report on Women in Higher Education" with emphasis on "affirmative action" being taken by colleges and universities and concluding with an article on "Woman as Philanthropist" by Edna Geissler Morrill, director of financial development for the YWCA.

"Women make up their minds early in their mature years as to which organizations attract their concern and merit their support, and they are pretty consistent about maintaining it," Mrs. Morrill said.

"The surest route to philanthropic giving is through motivation," she continued. "How is motivation assured? Perhaps most lastingly, through involvement. . . . There is abundant evidence that as an individual's personal involvement with an organization's problems and progress increases, so does her gift. . . . And, it is important to remember, people rarely give without being asked and rarely repeat if they have not been thanked."[110]

A section of the *Journal* for November, 1972, was devoted to one of the year's major objectives: restoration of public confidence in higher education.

In his introductory article on "Restoring Public Confidence," Hesse said, "In a time of rapid communications when public opinion plays an increasingly vital role in the shaping of public policy, higher education as a community has neither defined its goals, determined the climate of public opinion, nor articulated its objectives, however diverse and mutable they may be. . . .

"It seems reasonable to expect that the higher education community should be able to speak with a common voice on the essential goals while offering dialogue and discussion on others. Areas of agreement can and must be articulated while disagreements are debated and offered as viable alternatives. And all must be supplemented by regional and local objectives. . . .

"If higher education hopes to achieve the understanding and support of the national community, it must have some knowledge of what people think and believe and *want*. There are some who would have us believe that the erosion of public confidence is complete, never to be restored, while others may insist that nothing has really changed, at least not drastically. The point is we don't really know.

"It is at least as important, then, to inform those in higher education of public attitudes; that is, what the various populations think about college education and its various elements. It is equally important to acknowledge that some misgivings and loss of confidence are or may be justified, and in order for confidence to be regained, certain reforms and changes may indeed be required. At the same time, it is recognized that all of higher education cannot be allowed to become a pale reflection of public attitudes; the public should be persuaded to accept the idea of the university as a setting for breakthroughs in new thoughts and ideas, for departures from the conventional and the ordinary, for adventure in the life of the mind. Therefore, the results of a public opinion survey would be most helpful in terms of encouraging and sustaining a multifaceted dialogue between the higher education community and all its constituencies toward arriving at a common understanding of the goals and purposes of higher education and of the ways in which those goals ought to be pursued in a spirit of freedom and flexibility and without the intrusive force of government."[111]

Corbin Gwaltney, editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, said that "curtailing and cheapening your communications with the public and with your alumni and other friends in these crucial times is the height of folly."

"What higher education does in the weeks and months ahead—and how we write and talk about what education does in the weeks and months ahead—will have a large part in determining where our society goes, for at least the balance of this century," Gwaltney declared. "We, or our predecessors, have tended to botch the job in the past. We, or our successors, must *not* botch it in the future, as we and our institutions work to reearn and restore public confidence in higher education. . . .

"Too many of us thought that communications in our field meant projecting an 'image' rather than reflecting truth. Too many of us thought that communication in our field meant reassuring the old grads, or the big donors, or the state legislators, about the essential harmlessness of our colleges and universities. Too many of us thought it meant emphasizing nostalgia and tradition while downplaying some of the *other* qualities of a first-rate institution of higher education—restlessness and change. . . .

"Such idiocy, to think that the best interests of colleges and universities—those custodians of man's knowledge, those pursuers of truth—could possibly by served by twisting knowledge—by suppressing truth! Yet it is an idiocy that persists. It is an idiocy that got us where we are today—mistrusted by youth and unloved by their elders, whom we have deceived into thinking that higher education functions best when it functions harmlessly."

Gwaltney blamed communicators in all walks of life, not just those responsible for information about colleges and universities, for the loss of trust they and their institutions had suffered, saying that they "jazzed up their messages, cloaked them in all sorts of rhetorical devices that were designed to give them an aura of believability, of honesty, of sincerity, of logic."

"Naturally," he asserted, "this varnishing of the truth, this prettying-up of the message, didn't fool anybody for long. No mere technique can survive the merciless exposure it gets nowadays, especially on television. . . . So nobody believes anybody, any more. Skepticism, which was a healthy thing, is now cynicism, which isn't. Honest words have lost their honesty, in many people's minds. Value words have betrayed their values. Concept words mock their concepts."

Conditions of the day demanded, Gwaltney emphasized, a strengthening, not a weakening of college communications programs even if an institution was paring its public relations budget elsewhere.

"At every critical juncture in the affairs of an institution of higher education," he declared, "the effectiveness of communications is, more often than not, the single most important factor that determines which way the tide will run. . . . Once you have convinced the budget makers of that, the really *big* changes must be made. They must consist of a rigorous cleansing of your communications program—ridding it of any characteristics that smack of the old-time ad man or press agent, or are less than honest; cleaning out all the hoked-up elements that may be costing you the trust of your youngest and oldest constituents alike. . . .

"The big change must also include a return to completely candid reporting in every channel of communication you employ: speeches, alumni publications, fund-raising brochures, press releases, legislative relations activities, and your own meetings of staff and volunteers. This must extend even into those areas where your less sophisticated colleagues might tell you that complete candor is unwise, because it might offend a legislator, or an influential alumnus, or a dean. . . .

"To an extraordinary degree, the restoration of public faith in that spirit—and of the higher education enterprise—is in the hands of us who have the courage—and the wisdom—and the will—to communicate it."[112]

College communicators who had been relying on print media in most of their efforts got in January, 1973, for the first time in an ACPRA publication a comprehensive picture of the opportunities and challenges existing in electronic audio-visual media. In that month Editor Hesse published articles which discussed the possibilities now available through cable antenna television (CATV), audio and video cassettes, sound/slide units, and high speed duplicating processes as well as radio, television, and motion pictures. Electronic media, it was emphasized, had one great weakness: their messages were fleeting. On the other hand, they made possible an illusion of reality that could be more meaningful than the reality it represented.[113]

ACPRA since 1965 had been involved in collecting data with which to analyze alumni, publications, fund-raising and public relations costs, in every case using the traditional method of seeking expenditures on a departmental basis. Now in 1973, with a grant from the United States Steel Foundation, it introduced a new method—a resource allocation information system—to enable managers to make an ongoing analysis of resource expenditures relative to results sought. Described with charts and tables in an article in the *Journal*, the system grew from the third of a series of management studies made by President Leslie.[114]

The old system, Leslie wrote, had three principal inadequacies: (1) not all of the activities performed by the IAP [institutional advancement program] offices were for IAP objectives; (2) other individuals, such as the president, were substantially involved in formal IAP activities; (3) most institutions were not using uniform comparable cost accounting practices. The new resource allocation system differed from previous procedures in two ways: program element categories did not necessarily conform to existing departmental organization, and personnel and support expenditures were allocated according to program elements.

"Reliable data are at the core of all aspects of the management process," Leslie asserted, "and the objective of the resource allocation system should be to enable institutions to assemble data for planning, control, and evaluation purposes."

To help managers achieve maximum results in each phase of the institutional advancement program yet keep a tight rein on expenditures and evaluate results, Leslie advocated breaking the IAP into five elements: (1) information services, internal and external; (2) governmental relations; (3) constituency relations—cultivation of the mass audience, individuals, and small groups; (4) fund solicitation—for annual gifts, deferred gifts, and special project gifts; and (5) professional advancement. Using the charts developed during the study, a manager could keep a record of the percentage of each staff member's time devoted to each of the five elements. With salary figures in hand he could then determine the cost of the time each staff member devoted to each element. Additional divisions were also possible to show the cost of items, such as those for office operations, travel, special events, and publications within each program element.

"The development of a consistent, informative picture of expenditures from year to year—an institutional profile—is the prime reason for careful definition of program elements and activities by each institution," Leslie wrote. "If the rationale for the inclusion of a particular activity, or portion of that activity, in a certain program element is carefully described, guidelines will be provided for future management generations. Consistency and comparability will then be achieved for more effective planning and control."

Conferences, institutes, and workshops in a larger number than in any past year were held for members and prospective members of ACPRA in 1972-73. In addition to the School for Administrators, the Summer Academy, the nine district conferences, and the national conference, three special conferences were sponsored by the national office, and twenty miniconferences on such subjects as program management, electronic media, legislative relations, community colleges, information services, photography, and development were held under the auspices of districts.[115] All of the special conferences were held in Washington. In addition to that on "Effective Congressional Liaison Programs," they covered "Opinion Sampling and Survey Research" and "Pooled Income Funds." A fourth special conference, on "Implementing Deferred Gift Programs," was to have been held in May but was postponed until October, 1973.[116]

Women were in charge for the first time when the 1973 national conference was held in San Diego. Mary Ann Lockwood of the University of Oregon Medical School was conference chairman and Ardys Heise of the University of California-San Diego was conference director. Held July 9-11, the conference attracted 650 registrants, more than 150 of them accompanied by their spouses. Nearly 200 individuals were participants in the two-and-a-half-day program. To provide time for discussion on a wider variety of subjects, thirty-one breakfast seminars, twenty-one concurrent sessions, and eight special sessions, also run concurrently, were scheduled to form most of the program. Only four general sessions were held, on such major interest subjects as "Pressures in Higher Education," "Affirmative Action and Student Admissions Guidelines," "Increasing Pervasiveness of Government in Higher Education," and "The Future of Public Communications."[117]

The first speaker for the conference, was Lyman A. Glenny, director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. He came supported by an array of statistics which led him to half-a-dozen thought-provoking predictions: no greater proportion of state budgets going into higher education in 1980 than in 1973; less funding for higher education as a result of the establishment of a new set of priorities dropping higher education to a lower position than before; a reduction of actual dollars for higher education as the federal government shifted its aid from categorical programs to student financial aid; elimination of higher education as a growth industry unless an entirely new constituency could be attracted and continuing education became a pattern of American life; an increasing tendency by those wanting training for career education to attend proprietary and industrial schools rather than the traditional college or university; and a negative impact from collective bargaining.

Glenny concluded that all these factors pointed toward centralized planning with the challenge "to encompass all new postsecondary educational forms, delivery systems, and types of programs while promoting innovation, flexibility, adaptability, and opportunity."[118]

Scott M. Cutlip, professor of journalism at the University of Wisconsin and the author of several books on public relations, "laid it on the line" in an address on "Applications of the Information Explosion to Collegiate Communications Systems." After emphasizing that "the task of the public relations practitioner is to communicate—from your institution's claimant publics to the managers of your institutions and from the managers of your institution to your constituent publics," Cutlip told his listeners that the exploding computer-based technology demanded that they rethink their methods and procedures.

Looking at the future, Cutlip saw up to 500 TV channels; audiences equipped with two-way communications systems for rapid feedback; low cost information banks; a multiplicity of suburban newspapers; picture-phones and two-or-more-way hookups with no cost concern for distance or time; broadcast media changes including quadrasonic recording and broadcasting; two-way cable systems and facsimile services; and fund raising by the use of interconnnected closed circuit cable systems.

"The awesome new technology," Cutlip concluded, "makes the public relations practitioner's task more difficult and demanding because it must be harnassed imaginatively. Public relations practitioners are confronted with the command to shape up by bringing more precision to their feedback; if they don't they are likely to find themselves shipped out to the junkheap of obsolescence."[119]

ACPRA's award for distinguished service to higher education was presented to the William K. Kellogg Foundation at the national conference "in recognition of its service and support to higher education in this country." No presidential citation was awarded to a member in 1973, but the Board of Trustees decided that this award, starting in 1974, would be named in memory of Frank Ashmore, ACPRA's executive director from 1959 to 1961 who had died in April.[120]

Grants of $5,000 from the Ford Motor Company Fund and $3,500 from the Weyerhaeuser Company enabled the Association to continue its National Honors and National Communications Competitions in 1973. Eight institutions received $500 incentive grants and certificates of exceptional achievement. Cornell University, Fordham University, Towson State College, University of California-University-wide Office, and the University of Pittsburgh received honors "for outstanding achievements in public relations and development," and Guilford College, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, and University of Tennessee received awards "for outstanding communications programs advancing the understanding and support of higher education." Seventeen institutions also received special citations in the National Honors Competition and 146 received similar recognition in the National Communications Competition.[121]

By the time the 1973 national conference was held actions taken jointly and separately by ACPRA and AAC had all but assured that the two organizations would be merged by the end of the 1973-74 fiscal year. By early March the results of AAC's self-study, described as "one of the most sophisticated ever done for a nonprofit organization," were later published in an eighty-two-page booklet titled *Renewal*, which revealed strong sentiment for merger among all segments of AAC. In brief, the study, conducted by Effective Leadership, Inc. (ELI) of Washington, revealed that sixty-nine percent of the 1,340 AAC members participating in the survey believed that one organization should evolve from AAC and ACPRA. Sixty-eight percent thought that this should happen within two years.[122]

With the results of the ELI study as the basis for its deliberations, AAC's Self-Study Committee met March 26-29 and, "in the spirit of merger," developed a statement "concerning the purpose, priorities, and programs of any new organization comprising members of the two present organizations." This statement was then endorsed by AAC's Executive Committee:

> "*Preamble*. From the genesis and throughout the development of any new organization, it is essential that the volunteer spirit, the personal and professional comradeship and helpfulness, and the high standards long characteristic of the American Alumni Council be preserved and fostered.
>
> "*Purpose*. The purpose of this organization shall be to continue and to further develop sound relationships between educational institutions and their supporting constituencies, recognizing that, of these, the alumni relationship is the most enduring—requiring the national leadership of the organization to redefine and enhance the role of alumni in the educational enterprise.
>
> "*Program*. Programs shall be offered to develop professional skills in publications, fund raising, public relations, and management with awareness of the special relationship to those fields. Basic to this organization will be a program in long-term research and development, with appropriate financial allocations, to: (a) Define models of alumni development and support, e. g., to promote alumni representation in decision making, to increase alumni sophistication about the goals and problems of modern education, to help alumni continue growth beyond the campus into the life of society, to improve the image of alumni as constituent members of their institutions; (b) improve professional roles and define the skills necessary to increase involvement and support and to develop imaginative, creative, and technical professional roles; (c) provide models concerning the special nature of educational fund raising; (d) provide a better understanding of communications and public relations as techniques of achieving institutional goals; (e) provide data about membership needs and new programs.
>
> "*Initial Volunteer Leadership/Staff*. The American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Association shall each provide forty percent of the membership of the board of the new organization. The remaining twenty percent shall come from outside the membership of the present organizations and shall be equally oriented to both the alumni focus and the institutional support focus of the new organization. Staff needs shall be determined through management by objectives and job analysis as implemented by the chief executive officer.
>
> "*For Final Consideration*. Several areas require further consideration, such as the organizational structure, including membership classification, district alignment, dues and fees, and member representation on the Board of Directors and on committees. Also requiring further discussion are current AAC priorities and organizational style. It was the consensus of the committee that the word 'alumni' should be in the name of the new organization."[123]

The AAC's "Spirit of Merger" statement was used as the basis for discussion by the AAC-ACPRA Joint Study Committee when it met April 18. The preamble was changed only to include the words "and the American College Public Relations Association." and the purpose was reworded to read: "The new organization—if possible—should connote the fact that it has been established to improve professional concerns, competencies, and skills of those involved in alumni relations, public affairs (governmental and community relations), development, communications (publications, visual aids, information services), and management."

The group decided that a Merger Study Committee of ten persons should be formed, five from each of the two organizations including at least one from AAC and one from ACPRA who had served on the Wells Commission of 1971-72. The chairman and chairman-elect of each organization would also be included as would the two presidents *ex officio*. After the Merger Study Committee had been formed and had agreed on general goals for its work with a timetable for their achievement, at least four task forces would be appointed with an equal number of members from the two organizations. These task forces would be: Legal (researching of bylaws, office leases, contracts in force, legal commitments, dissolution problems, investment counsel, and perquisites, retirement, and fringe benefits); Regional Organization (possible geographic changes, liaison to governing board, etc.); Finance (pooling of resources, budgets, dues, salaries, services, and supplies); Program (including selection of name, national and district meetings, educational activities, publications). The task forces would be creatures of the Merger

Study Committee and would go out of existence upon completion and acceptance of their reports.

The Joint Study Committee also decided at the April 18 meeting that the executive officer of the new organization would be elected by the Board of Directors and have the title of president; that the total cost of institutional membership should be less than the sum of the two present memberships; that the financial resources of the two organizations at both the district and national level be merged, then pooled and redistributed in an equitable manner; that implementation of the merger be set for September 1, 1974 (if a decision to merge grew from the work of the Merger Study Committee); and that both AAC and ACPRA would appropriate from their reserve funds $12,500 in order to finance the study. Additional funds were to be sought from foundations.[124]

The newly appointed Merger Study Committee, mistakenly called the Joint Merger Committee in its minutes, met in Newport, Rhode Island, on June 22. Representing ACPRA were Joseph J. Adams, University of Oregon Medical School; John Callahan, Amherst College; Edwin M. Crawford, University of Virginia; Michael Radock, University of Michigan; and David S. Thompson, Princeton University. From AAC came Wesley E. Bevins, Jr., Harvard Law School; Ronald G. Hyde, Brigham Young University; Robert E. Linson, Ball State University; Robert M. Rhodes, Brown University; and Dwight V. Roberts, University of Colorado. Radock and Rhodes, cochairmen of the old Joint Study Committee, were named cochairmen of the new committee.

After a discussion of the difference between association and corporate law, the committee determined to move away from the merger concept to that of forming an entirely new organization after the two associations had been allowed to go out of existence. This procedure was suggested by John Holt Myers, the AAC-ACPRA legal counsel, and he was authorized to develop a model set of bylaws establishing a new corporation, as yet unnamed.

The committee then voted to employ as consultants Effective Leadership, Inc., which had helped AAC with its study. Presidents of the two organizations were charged with the task of developing jointly the budget for the total study and approaching foundations for support. John Callahan, soon to become chairman of ACPRA's Board of Trustees, was authorized to appoint the four task forces. Plans were started for a merger conference to be held in the fall with work of the task forces receiving major attention.[125] To each task force, two cochairmen were appointed, one from ACPRA and one from AAC: Finance, Arthur J. Horton, Princeton University, and Robert Waldo, ACPRA's board chairman; Legal, Wesley Bevins and David Thompson; Program, Edwin Crawford and Dwight Roberts; Regions, Joseph Adams and Robert Linson.

Both AAC and ACPRA closed their annual conferences on July 11, the former in Vancouver and the latter in San Diego. On the next day the Joint Study Committee assembled in San Francisco for a four-and-a-half hour meeting.

The group early decided that ACPRA should do a self-study similar to but less sophisticated than the one AAC had done. Few members of ACPRA were fully informed about the current discussions with AAC and many seemed to have concerns which needed to be allayed. Cletis Pride was made responsible for preparing the study questionnaire before the end of July.[126]

Bob Waldo, quiet but efficient chairman of ACPRA's Board of Trustees, spoke in behalf of ACPRA many times during 1972-73. In several of these talks in midterm he had commented that "We are on the move," and by July he could look back on a year of outstanding achievement as he turned over the chairman's gavel to John Callahan. In addition to the advances already recorded in this chapter the Association could show achievements in the areas of finance and membership.

With income and expenses running neck and neck when the 1972 national conference was held, the Board of Trustees at its first meeting under Waldo in July, 1972, started to discuss the need to increase fees. In November the Executive Committee voted to have Leslie present an updated recommendation on fee increases at the joint meeting of the Executive and Finance Committees in February. At the November meeting the Executive Committee had also voted to establish three specific policies related to fee increases: (1) The current level of operating reserves, the equivalent of one year's operating expenses, would be maintained but income from the reserve fund in excess of operating reserves would be allocated to the annual operating budget. (2) As a minimum standard, membership fees should reflect inflation and increased costs as evidenced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics index. (3) The Association would continue to be alert to new membership services and to ways of providing them. The committee also decided that fees should be structured "to provide amounts that would remain constant through 1974-75, not exceeding the current and projected percentage of annual inflation." The committee determined that, in setting 1973-74 fees, they would seek $40,000 to $45,000 in new income.[127]

Despite strong opposition from one district and threats from Georgia institutions to withdraw from ACPRA and form their own organization, the Board of Trustees in February approved the Association's first general fee increase in nine years. In a memo to members, Waldo explained that the increase, approximately ten percent in most categories, was necessary because of "inflationary pressures of the past few years, coupled with the prospect of continued inflation in the future." The one category of institution whose fee jumped more than ten percent was two-year colleges. The fee for these institutions was hiked from $100 to $165, but for the increased sum each would be allowed two members representatives rather than one as in the past.

Waldo's message also announced the creation of a professional associates category in which the fee would be $25. It had been estimated that, while many institutions enrolled additional member representatives beyond the number to which they were entitled under the enrollment formula in vogue, fewer than one-third of the professional staff in member institutions were participating in ACPRA benefits. The professional associates category was expected to attract many individuals willing to pay their own fee in order to receive stated benefits: *Techniques,* the Association's standard publication for the professional practitioner; periodic mailing notices of regional and national conferences; district newsletters and district conference mailings; and listing in the professional associates section of the ACPRA *Membership Directory*. The previous extra member representative category was retained in the new fee schedule with the cost rising from $42 to $48. Extra member representatives received all mailings of the Association, including *College and University Journal* and the *Membership Directory*.[128]

The wisdom of the action to increase fees was soon demonstrated. The financial report for 1972-73 revealed that ACPRA, while ending its ninth consecutive year in the black, did so by a margin of only $487. Income for the year, including $22,148 in grants, had been $471,332, while expenses had totaled $470,845. Of the latter amount $3,411 had gone for expenses related to the merger with AAC. Net worth of the Association now stood at $367,934.[129]

Despite the financial squeeze, membership kept on climbing in 1972-73. Institutional memberships now stood at 1,344 while member representatives numbered 3,600. In addition, the Association listed sixty educational associates (accredited nonprofit secondary schools and tax-exempt nonprofit organizations devoting a substantial part of their activities to the service of higher education) and fifty-two subscribers (organizations, firms, and persons not eligible for institutional membership or affiliation as educational associates).[130]

Exciting as 1972-73 had been, an even more exciting year lay ahead as ACPRA and AAC hammered out final decisions which would merge them into one organization "devoted to the advancement and understanding of higher education." Elected by the Board of Trustees to serve with Chairman John Callahan, ex-Chairman Waldo, and President Leslie *ex officio* during this eventful year were Edwin M. Crawford, University of Virginia, chairman-elect; Robert R. Lynch, Jr., University of Florida, secretary; Joseph J. Brady, Case Western Reserve University; Leo O. Case, Occidental College; and Ruth Prescott, Grinnell College.[131]

The Decision Is Made

Countless hours were dedicated by the officers, trustees, and staffs of the two organizations and members of the Joint Study Committee, its task forces, commissions, committees, and subcommittees in 1973-74 to working out with meticulous care the details leading to the merger of the American College Public Relations Association and the American Alumni Council. Thousands of hours were spent at weekly meetings, and between these meetings came additional hours of thought and preparation. Beyond these hours were thousands more involving the membership at district and regional meetings, so that each member representative in the organizations could have complete information about the proposed merger.

In a report to all member representatives of ACPRA on August 17, John Callahan, chairman of the Board of Trustees, and Michael Radock, cochairman of the Joint Study Committee, announced that the trustees of both organizations had given merger "overwhelming approval." Previously, a random sampling of the Association's membership revealed seventy-six percent in favor of the action. Now, the Callahan-Radock report polled member representatives once more with an eight-page questionnaire, meant to determine not only their attitude toward merger, but also what they liked and didn't like about the present association, what they would want in services from the new organization, what goals they thought the organization should emphasize, and what name or names they had to suggest.

The intensive year of work on merger began with a meeting to which the Joint Study Committee invited some fifty individuals, representing a cross section of the membership of both organizations, at Oak Brook, Illinois, on September 26. At the conference, the group would begin building the model for a single organization.

By this time, returns from the questionnaire ACPRA had mailed on August 17 were in hand. More than 1,800 member representatives participated in the ACPRA study and eighty-two percent of them supported the one-organization concept. Only seven percent disapproved.

An overwhelming majority of the respondents emphasized that present programs and services should be retained and strengthened by the new organization which most thought should be formed within two years. Almost eighty percent called for increased use of applied research to help improve programs of member institutions and the skills of practitioners.

Opening the new organization to the best available talent, "regardless of previous roles in the organizational structure," was seen as the most desirable goal for the new organization by almost ninety percent. Approximately seventy-five percent considered each of the following to be important or extremely important: Revamping the operation of large national conferences; encouraging the development of relationships among professional colleagues in order to share expertise; working with other associations to win public confidence for higher education; and promoting legislation important to higher education. The respondents indicated clearly that they wanted programming by functional areas—development, information services, alumni affairs, executive management, public affairs, and governmental relations—rather than by size or type of institutions. When asked about new programs, more chose "frequent, inexpensive miniconferences at local and regional levels" than any other possibility suggested. Other major choices were "grouping of members by special interests for programs, services and special publications; formal training for new people in the field; and extensive career development programs for professionals. A large percentage of the respondents indicated belief that the new organization should be more "innovative and creative."

Most members indicated that they were not concerned about the name of the new organization. Almost all appeared willing to accept the term "institutional advancement" to describe the major functions of the organization. In fact, more than 200 of the 400 names suggested included the word "advancement."[132]

As those in attendance at the Oak Brook Conference compared results of the AAC and ACPRA self-studies, they decided that "more differences exist within the membership of each group than exist between the two. Indeed, there seem to be no basic differences which would seriously endanger unification, while numerous similiarities of goals and interest promise a successful combined approach. In short, the time has come to work together to create a new organization capable of better serving the individual, the institution, and education." As a result, the spirit of the conference was "one of unity and cooperation" and "a sense of excitement over the possibilities now opening to both organizations served to heighten the deliberations."[133]

A major decision was made at the Oak Brook Conference. A comprehensive program of communications would be established through which member representatives, by frequent mail reports and by presentations at district meetings, would receive every conceivable piece of information on the values of merger. At district meetings of both ACPRA and AAC, presentations aimed at increasing support for the single organization concept would be made. These would include audio-visuals; talks by leaders, such as the presidents and board chairmen of each organization, district officers, trustees, and task force members; and interviews with members of each organization and with others having a role of interest in the emergence of a single organization. "Town meeting sessions" would also be a part of each district program, with prepared question-and-answer sheets. Still another means of carrying the message of merger to members of both groups would be a brochure called "We Will," containing sixteen promises of unity and service. No vote on merger would be taken at district meetings. Although the format for the new organization was beginning to emerge, the conferees at Oak Brook decided that the final model "should be produced only after maximum input from district meetings and other sources."[134]

At a meeting the following week the Joint Study Committee planned reports to the ACPRA membership on the results of the Association's self-study and to the membership of both organizations on the results of the Oak Brook Conference. It also passed a resolution "that it is the intent of the Joint Study Committee to seek an affirmative vote from the membership [of both organizations] prior to taking legal action to create a new organization."[135]

Mailed on November 12 with a memo from Radock and Robert Rhodes, cochairmen of the Joint Study Committee, the report again invited the memberships to "tell us how it [the new organization] can best serve your professional needs." The report closed with a statement on "Imperatives for Success: Unity and Responsiveness."

"To build an open society that is responsive to the professional needs of the entire membership," this section said in its final paragraph, "demands an organization geared to the professional development of the individual. From the reports of the task forces and the work of the Joint Study Committee, the shape of the new organization begins to be visible. The success of the organization will rest on three imperatives: unity of purpose and goals, external responsiveness in terms of improved services to members, and internal responsiveness in terms of involvement with the leadership structure. We now look to the entire membership to build such an open society, and to make that vision a reality."[136]

On December 7, John Holt Myers, legal counsel to the Joint Study Committee, reported that both AAC and ACPRA faced a legal problem in their move toward dissolution before joining in a new organization. The dissolution clause in ACPRA's Articles of Organization called for distribution of liquidated assets among its members. The dissolution clause in AAC's constitution could be interpreted as requiring an absolute vote of two-thirds of the total membership. Myers consequently recommended that the two organizations seek amendments which would substitute a common dissolution clause in their constitutions. After subsequent discussion by the Joint Study Committee, AAC and ACPRA in March and April sought approval of such a clause. Members of both organizations voted overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment which authorized dissolution and transfer of assets to a new organization.[137]

With expenses of effecting merger expected to exceed $100,000, the leaders of AAC and ACPRA had decided early to seek funds from foundations. After six months of fruitless effort, ACPRA President John Leslie told his Board of Trustees on December 7 that "chances for new financing are not promising." However, when representatives of the Joint Study Committee met for a planning session on December 27, Leslie was able to report that the United States Steel Foundation had pledged $20,000 to "top off" any other grants received for merger. Two months later the William Kellogg Foundation made a $38,300 grant to help defray expenses of merger, and still later the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation contributed $25,000 to put the merger into effect.[138] These grants, coupled with $12,500 appropriations each of the organizations had already made for merger expenses, assured completion of the unification program without undue financial stress in the future.

Realizing that much remained to be done if the Joint Study Committee was to bring a single working organization into being by September 1,1974, the full committee was scheduled to convene on January 19-20 to begin filling in details for the model of the merged organization. Specific goals to be achieved by September 1 would also be determined at that time. To expedite progress toward this end four subcommittees were appointed—programming, financial structure and marketing research, communications, and legal. Balloting by members on the merger would be held in March by AAC following its final district meeting and that for ACPRA in April after its last district conference.[139]

By the time the Joint Study Committee met January 19-20 it had added two women to its previously all-male membership of ten. Robert Rhodes, chairman of AAC's board, introduced Holly Fowler of The Shipley School as his organization's representative and John Callahan, ACPRA's board chairman, announced the appointment of Nancy Stuart of Portland (Oregon) State University for his association.

Discussions on procedural matters, adoption of a timetable meant to assure achievement of unification by September 1, and additional work on the model for the new organization filled the committee's agenda. With an increasing number of questions concerning outside consultants, it was decided to rely more heavily on Effective Leadership, Inc. (ELI) which had been serving the committee. Henceforth, James M. Shultz or Oscar G. Mink, or both, of that firm attended all meetings of the committee and that of the organizing board in May. Shultz said ELI could do any marketing research necessary but urged that the staffs of the merging organizations be used as much as possible for this task. Mink saw joint-action programming as the major concern for the moment and recommended that the committee "stick with the good existing programs, make no great changes at this point but begin to lay the groundwork for new programs."[140] The model for the new organization to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval should cover, the Joint Study Committee decided, the organizational structure, staff, dues structure, and articles of incorporation.

Radock announced the $38,300 grant from the Kellogg Foundation at the meeting of the Joint Study Committee held in San Antonio, Texas, March 2-3. Cletis Pride, who had been participating in the meetings along with other members of the ACPRA professional staff, reported that a market study conducted during February had revealed that the new organization could eventually serve nearly 2,700 institutions and approximately 16,000 individuals. The survey, based on the government's 1972-73 *Educational Directory*, indicated that there were 2,686 institutions of higher learning in the United States and that 1,066 of these were affiliated with neither AAC nor ACPRA. Using a random sample of fifty-five institutions, a computer printout from the National Center for Educational Statistics, and a spot-check follow-up with eight of the fifty-five institutions to verify the computer data, the market study projected a member representative potential of 15,575 of which 9,675 were not then affiliated with AAC or ACPRA.[141]

On March 2 the committee authorized its legal counsel, John Holt Myers, to file immediately in the District of Columbia the necessary papers to apply for a charter. John Leslie and Winston E. Forrest, Jr., presidents of ACPRA and AAC, respectively, were to sign these papers with Myers. The committee next decided that the organizing board for the new organization should include thirty-six persons—twelve appointed by each of the two governing boards, plus the Joint Study Committee. It also voted four recommendations for action by the organizing board: (1) that it set up commissions to address themselves to such areas as districts and regions, program and services, and finances and dues; (2) that the officers for the new organization include a chairman, chairman-elect, chairman-elect designate, secretary, and treasurer; (3) that the Executive Committee of the organizing board be composed of the elected officers of that board and members of the Joint Study Committee; and (4) that members of the professional staffs of the merging organizations be assured of employment during the first year of the new organization's existence.[142]

As another step in keeping the general membership of their organizations fully informed, Radock and Rhodes wrote "Long Road to Unity: AAC/ACPRA" which appeared as an insert in the March issues of *College and University Journal* and *Alma Mater*. Apparently, some members of the two organizations had become impatient at the delay in effecting the merger. AAC/ACPRA had been selected as the temporary name for the new organization.

"We can assure you there will be no unnecessary delay," Radock and Rhodes wrote in the article which summarized changes in organization of the last thirty years; the building and planning the Joint Study Committee had done on the basis of the self-studies, the Oak Brook Conference, district meetings, and face-to-face and telephone conversations; and the reasons why unification now seemed assured. "We are committed to having some form of organization in being by September 1, 1974," the report continued, "and, given a favorable vote by both memberships, we intend to keep that committment. Keeping it won't entail undue haste, in our opinion. After all, this is the third decade in which some of you have worked toward the goal of unification. And this is the third year since AAC-ACPRA discussions began under the leadership of Indiana Chancellor Herman B. Wells."

The committee leaders warned that not all problems would be solved by September 1. "No matter how much time we devote to planning and model building," they wrote, "we can't possibly anticipate all the problems that may arise. We must all face the likelihood of some confusion, even possibly the loss of some momentum in some programming while the new organization adjusts. Much of the time and energies of the professional staff and volunteer leadership will be devoted to the chores of midwifery during the next several months. But once that's behind us you can expect rapid improvement, until programs and services are better than those now offered by either organization."[143]

The Joint Study Committee, augmented by five staff members from AAC, five from ACPRA, and the ELI representatives, met in Washington on April 16. After a seven-hour session devoted largely to the content and phrasing of proposed bylaws, it met again on May 7 with staff members and an ELI representative to prepare for the meeting of the organizing board scheduled for May 29. Although returns were incomplete, early results from the ballot which had been mailed to member institutions on April 15 indicated that the ACPRA vote for merger would approach unanimity. Returns from AAC's voting had been received earlier and revealed that ninety-five percent of the Council's members favored merger.[144]

Serving as a Nominating Committee for the organizing group, the Joint Study Committee as its first act on May 7 recommended unanimously the following slate of officers for consideration by that body: Chairman, Edwin M. Crawford, vice president for public affairs, University of Virginia; chairman-elect, Wesley E. Bevins, Jr., assistant dean of the Harvard Law School and director of its annual fund; secretary, Joseph J. Brady, vice president for development, Case Western Reserve University; and treasurer, Michael J. Koll, treasurer-business manager of the alumni association, University of California, Berkeley. No nomination was made for the office of chairman-elect-designate, created under the new bylaws.

It was now time for the appointment of a Search Committee to seek out the best possible person to become president of the new organization. It would include three members from AAC and three from ACPRA, and appointments would be made by Ronald G. Hyde, chairman of AAC's board; John Callahan, chairman of ACPRA's board, and Rhodes and Radock, the cochairmen of the Joint Study Committee. The committee would be charged with convening and electing its chairman by June 1, then moving "to attract applicants, meet affirmative action and equal opportunity requirements, objectively identify strong candidates, and recommend no less than three and no more than five candidates in order of preference by July 1 for final selection by the organizing board." It would use ELI's representatives as consultants. The Search Committee's budget was not to exceed $20,000, including staff costs, member's expenses, meeting costs, interview expenses, and consultants' costs.[145]

Finances, the bylaws, and program planning occupied much of the Joint Study Committee's time at the May 7 meeting. The members studied three-year income and expense records (1971-1973), which showed that AAC and ACPRA's combined receipts and combined expenses for each of these years had approached or slightly exceeded $1,050,000.[146] The committee then adopted a tentative budget of that figure for 1974-75. This budget, however, included $150,000 for anticipated nonrecurring expenses involved in setting up the unified office.[147]

A dues structure designed to raise approximately $550,000 in annual fees was presented by Leslie and Forrest. This schedule, drawn after a careful study of current memberships, projected an initial institutional membership of 1,944, including forty-nine international schools and 366 independent secondary schools, plus 160 educational associates and subscribers. The total number of member representatives projected for the new organization was 7,892. Following the general pattern suggested by Leslie and Forrest, the organizing board later in the month set the dues and the number of member representatives for four-year institutions as follow: 1-999 students enrolled, $200, three member representatives; 1,000-2,999, $275, four; 3,000-4,999, $350, five; 5,000-9,999, $425, six; 10,000 and over, $500, seven. Two-year colleges would pay dues of $175 with the privilege of three representatives. International institutions (except those in Canada and Mexico) and secondary schools would each pay $150 and be entitled to two representatives. The fee for educational associates and subscribers would be $200, and additional representatives in all categories could be added for $30 each.[148]

Committee members, agreeing that "the new organization must have a new image, projected through new publications," decided to cease publication of *College and University Journal* and *Alma Mater*, the major publications of the parent organizations. *ACPRA News* and *Dateline Washington*, however, could be pulled together with AAC's *Commentary* as a single publication. Additional plans for publications were made at the meeting of the organizing board on May 29. The new publication combining the *News, Dateline Washington*, and *Commentary* would appear in July under the title *Interim*. ACPRA's *Techniques*, shown by the Association's self-study to be one of the most valued services offered by the Association, and *Education Abstracts* would be continued. A committee headed by W. Harry Durham of Clemson University was charged with drawing long-range publication plans.[149]

A memorandum from John Callahan, based on the returns to date, announced to ACPRA voting members on May 16 that "the merger of ACPRA and the American Alumni Council has been approved by an overwhelming majority." Four days later a news story was released, written by Cletis

Pride and timed for publication with an advertisement in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* announcing the search for a president. It proclaimed, "after two years of discussion by their leaders, two of the nation's major educational associations will join forces later this year." The release indicated that the successor organization, as yet unnamed, would serve almost 2,000 institutions and 6,000 individuals and concentrate on improving its members' effectiveness in such areas as alumni affairs, communications, development, public relations, and governmental relations.[150]

By the time the organizing board convened for its historic meeting on May 29-30 it had in hand the official returns from the merger ballot which had been mailed to the voting representatives of 1,320 ACPRA member institutions on April 15. Of 1,012 ballots returned, 990 were countable and of these 950, or ninety-four percent, favored merger. Thirty-eight were opposed and two abstained.[151]

Forty-four individuals attended the meeting of the organizing board, thirty-two of them members of the board. Also present were nine members of the AAC and ACPRA staffs, two representatives of Effective Leadership, Inc., and the Joint Study Committee's legal counsel, all as consultants.[152]

After taking action to recognize the existence and purpose of the organizing board and going on record as accepting "the responsibility to organize and become ready to accept the assets and obligations of the aforesaid organizations [AAC and ACPRA]," the board turned to the Articles of Incorporation and bylaws. These had been recommended by the Committee on Legal Affairs and approved earlier by the Joint Study Committee. They were adopted with the understanding that the officers of the organizing board would serve until August 31, 1975.[153]

Purposes of AAC/ACPRA as enunciated in both the Articles of Incorporation and the bylaws and approved by the District of Columbia, were: "to develop and foster sound relationships between member educational institutions and their various constituencies and to advance support for the member institutions by assisting in the education and development of those individuals associated with member institutions who work with those constituencies.

"In pursuit of these objectives and purposes," the articles and bylaws continued, "AAC/ACPRA shall assist its members in their efforts to improve relations with the various constituencies they serve and to which they are responsible as institutions of education. In so doing, AAC/ACPRA shall be concerned with all aspects of its members' relations within their own institutions as well as with the larger communities which they serve. AAC/ACPRA shall not perform the separate functions of its members, but shall provide the mechanism through which each member may improve its own efforts to advance understanding and support for its educational program."

Membership in the new organization would be open "only to nonprofit educational institutions listed in the *Educational Directory* (Higher Education) published by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, nonprofit independent schools which have been accredited, and nonprofit educational organizations closely associated with one or more of said entities; provided that no institution shall be eligible for membership unless it is entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under Section 115(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as a public educational institution or under Section 501(c)(3) and Section 509(a)(1) (2) or (3) of said code or similar provisions of prior or subsequent statutes." Individuals certified by institutions as engaged in activities designed to advance understanding of and support for those institutions would be eligible for enrollment as member representatives.[154]

Edwin Crawford, Wesley Bevins, Joseph Brady, and Michael Koll, nominated earlier by the Joint Study Committee to serve as chairman, chairman-elect, secretary, and treasurer, respectively, of the new board, were elected unanimously. By the same vote its was decided that the new office of chairman-elect-designate would be filled later by the Executive Committee. Believing that the background knowledge and experience gained by members of the Joint Study Committee would be invaluable, the group also voted that, for the next year only, the Executive Committee should be composed of joint study members and the four elected officers. Thus the organizing board approved an Executive Committee of fourteen: John L. Callahan, general secretary, Amherst College; Holly Fowler, director of alumnae activities, The Shipley School; Ronald G. Hyde, executive director, alumni relations, Brigham Young University; Robert E. Linson, executive director, alumni and development programs, Ball State University; Michael Radock, vice president for university relations and development, University of Michigan; Robert M. Rhodes, editor, *Brown Alumni Monthly*, Brown University; Dwight V. Roberts, director, development foundation, University of Colorado; Nancy Stuart, director, office of communications, Portland State University; Richard M. Ramin, vice president for public affairs, Cornell University, and David S. Thompson, executive secretary, Council for University Resources, Princeton University, plus the four officers. Ramin took the place of Joseph J. Adams, assistant to the dean, University of Oregon Medical School, who had been serving on the Joint Study Committee.

The selection of a new president promised to be one of the most important steps ahead for the organizing board. First, it approved the appointment of eight members to compose a Search Committee. With David Thompson as chairman, the committee included George L. Bradberry, Auburn University; Fay R. Biles, Kent State University; Robert G. Waldo, University of Oregon; and Callahan, Fowler, Hyde, and Koll. Rhodes and Radock would serve as consultants. Before the Joint Study Committee adjourned on May 30, the Search Committee held two meetings, began drafting the job description, and planned to seek nominations through a letter to each member representative of the two organizations, advertise in strategic publications, and hold meetings in Chicago, Atlanta, and Boston in June and July. Hopefully, the committee would have recommendations for the Board of Trustees by mid-July. It was a false hope. The job proved to be much larger than anticipated and almost four months would pass before the committee could complete the task of securing information on and conducting interviews with almost 200 individuals who sought or were nominated for the post.

Another committee whose work would be long and arduous was charged with recommending a name for the new organization. This committee, elected by the board, included John E. Dolibois, Miami University; Maralyn O. Gillespie, Swarthmore College; John E. Seelig, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary; J. Herbert White, Auburn University; and Robert Rhodes, who would serve as chairman.[155] With more than 400 names already suggested and many more to come, the committee would take even longer than the Search Committee to complete its assignment.

Commissions recommended by the Joint Study Committee would play a large role during the first year of the organization. The organizing board approved the appointment of Joseph Brady, Richard Ramin, and Dwight Roberts to head these groups on programs and services, finances and dues, and districts and regions, respectively. The commissions, as appointed later by Crawford, were composed of nine members for finances and dues, twenty-six for districts and regions, and thirty for programs and services.[156]

Working closely with the commissions would be a Committee on Legal Affairs and Procedures headed by Wesley Bevins. In case the need for the appointment of an interim president should arise in the fall, the Executive Committee would have the authority to act. The Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy, an important standing committee of ACPRA for more than a decade, would function as a joint committee of AAC/ACPRA for the time being under the leadership of Norman S. Fink of the University of Pennsylvania.[157]

As Chairman Crawford declared in the opening paragraph of a memorandum mailed to all members of AAC and ACPRA a few days after the organizing board adjourned, "The wise and practical people who comprise the membership of AAC/ACPRA have ordained a new and exciting future for a large segment of post-secondary education and independent schools. They have locked arms and resources in a unified endeavor to provide services and professional growth in a field that is vital to the advancement to these branches of learning."

Crawford stressed the importance of the commissions created on May 29. "The commissions," he emphasized, "will bring the thinking, the problems, and the aspirations of the membership to bear on policy decisions of the board and the Executive Committee. They will adopt a futuristic, long-range, creative view. Fire fighting will not be their function; rather, they will be building structures that won't burn. We look forward to their fresh insights to improve the quality of the organization and its programs in the years ahead. In doing this we expect to retain the best of what is and what has been and to build on that base developing new programs and services that will be responsive to the expectations of the membership, expressed mainly through the voice of the commissions and through research projects."[158]

Crawford's memo was mailed under a new letterhead which emphasized AAC/ACPRA as the temporary name of the new organization and described it as "The Unified Organization of the American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Association." It was a letterhead that would be used, not just for a few weeks as expected, but for nearly seven months.

Although many of ACPRA's leaders and much of its national office staff were concentrating on merger plans with their counterparts in AAC, the work of committees and attention to conferences, workshops, research, publications, and other services went on unabated.

Chairman John Callahan had announced as he took office in July, 1973, that more attention would be given to the role of women in public relations. Later he corresponded with women members of the Board of Trustees and made additional efforts to get recommendations for Association activities for women. Robert Waldo, chairman of the Nominating Committee for 1974-75, also planned a search for women before presenting a slate. Prior to the December meeting of the Board of Trustees, Callahan met with the four women in the group with the hope of presenting an action program before leaving office. In April he reported to the Executive Committee that each of the nine districts was having formal meetings on the status of women. The committee concurred in a recommendation that the national conference, to be held in Atlanta in July, should devote one session to the status of women.

Small though these efforts might seem to be, they bore fruit. Two of the districts elected women directors for 1974-75, and a session on "Women in Higher Education" was held during the national conference with Virginia Y. Trotter, assistant secretary for education of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, as the speaker. "The Case for Women's Colleges" was also discussed and more than twenty-five female members of the Association had places on the program as coordinators, speakers, moderators, chairpersons, and presenters of papers. When awards for the National Honors Program were announced during the conference, fifty-one women saw their work receive recognition. The number of women on the Board of Trustees also grew from four in 1973-74 to seven when the organizing board was named.[159]

Following up on discussions held at earlier meetings, ACPRA's trustees at their December meeting authorized the Committee on Professional Education, now operating in conjunction with an AAC committee, to spend up to $2,000 for consulting fees and related expenses with the understanding that the two organizations would share expenses equally. Objectives would be the establishment of a program of continuing professional education both for practitioners entering and for those experienced in the fields of alumni affairs, public relations, and fund raising. New resources such as correspondence courses, weekend seminars, and field advisers would be considered as well as existing resources such as conferences and workshops, summer institutes and academies, reference libraries and bibliographies, and microfiche. James Shultz of ELI was engaged as consultant, to formulate a program which could provide the basis for a foundation proposal.[160]

With the number of junior colleges increasing each year, the Junior and Community College Committee under Robert Gaffner of the Junior College District of St. Louis conducted a survey of two-year institutions for program ideas and requirements, planned spots for junior colleges on each district program, and arranged for a national conference roundtable on "The Community College and Its Community Relations."[161]

Reorganization of the Committee on Public Affairs under a new name, Committee on Governmental Affairs, was announced at the trustees' December meeting. Its first major project was the development of closer cooperation with the Public Affairs Council, composed of public affairs officers from business and industry. For three days in mid-May the Governmental Affairs Committee would sponsor the annual Conference on Governmental Affairs.

This conference, the last of nine held under ACPRA sponsorship during the year, was offered for collegiate administrators who had responsibility for liaison with Congress or federal government agencies. Discussion of appropriations, regulatory agencies, legislation, and tax reform were the subjects regularly covered. This year a special luncheon was held to honor Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Labor-Health, Education and Welfare Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and Congressman Daniel J. Flood, chairman of the corresponding committee in the House of Representatives.[162]

The other Association conferences of the year, bringing together approximately 900 individuals, covered "Marketing Your Deferred Giving Program" in Washington; "Researching and Approaching Foundations" in San Francisco, Atlanta, Chicago, and New York; "Managing the Communications Program" in Philadelphia and Chicago; and "Public Opinion Sampling and Survey Research" in Chicago. The annual School for Educational Administrators, designed as a review of basic elements of institutional advancement programs, drew 248 registrants in Atlanta and the Summer Academy, held as usual at the University of Notre Dame for a week in August, drew sixty-six "students" when it offered an intensive training program for individuals relatively new in the field of educational public relations and development.[163]

One of the fruits of the increasing cooperation between AAC and ACPRA was a stronger, more useful microfiche library inasmuch as the Association was able to draw from the library of the Council in preparing its "Info-Kits." By February, 1974, sixty different kits had been developed.

Announcement was made at the same time that the Communications Consultant Service, then in its second year, would provide comprehensive evaluations of total programs in publications and electronics as well as individual communications in the areas of student recruitment, development, special events, annual reports, catalogs, magazines, films, audio and visual tapes, slide presentations, multi-media presentations, posters, news, and information.[164]

The national office announced in September, 1973, that its Creative Publications Service, started in 1971, was being redesigned and would be available in 1974 at a much reduced price. In March it announced that all complete sets for the past two years had been sold and only a limited supply of individual issues remained.[165]

The 1973-74 year brought notable changes in ACPRA publications. ACPRA *News*, which had been published as an insert in *Techniques* since April, 1973, became a separate publication of unusual format (8½ × 11 inches which unfolded out to 11 × 17-inches) starting in November. It was absorbed as a feature of the transitional publication, *Interim*, in July, 1974. At the same time *Dateline Washington*, which had been bringing members pertinent information about happenings in the nation's capital since January, 1973, became an insert of the *News* until it also became a part of *Interim*. *Education Abstracts* continued through the year until it, too, became a section of the new publication.

The first issue of the *News* in its new format reported that two of ACPRA's past presidents had died early in the preceding month. Edward P. VonderHaar, vice president for public relations and development at Xavier University in Cincinnati and the only person ever to serve as president of both ACPRA (1952-53) and the Public Relations Society of America (1968) had died at the age of sixty-four on October 1. Josef F. Wright, retired public relations director at the University of Illinois and the Association's president in 1934-35, had died on October 5 at the age of eighty-one.[166]

The final edition of ACPRA *News*, dated June, announced the resignation of two members of the national office staff. John Leslie, the Association's chief executive since 1963, resigned to become president of a newly-organized Washington-based firm, Institutional Advancement Consultants, and Robert R. Hesse, director of communications services since 1971, to become president of Medaille College in Buffalo, New York.

To Leslie, who would be leaving on August 31, Board Chairman Callahan wrote: "When you joined the Association as executive vice president in 1963, the organization was in serious financial straits, its administration required redirection, and its program and services were in need of new thrust and vitality. You brought financial stability to the organization, excellent people to staff its functions, imagination to develop its programs, and management skill to orchestrate these components into sound and vibrant activity. We are grateful for your efforts over a decade of growth in membership, strength of management, and quality of service."

In the final five issues of its publication in 1973-74, *College and University Journal*, edited by Hesse and William A. McNamara, gave members a steady diet of the high-quality material that had won it the distinguished achievement award of the Educational Press Association of America the year before.

Many of the articles that appeared in those final issues of the *Journal*, and several of the shorter items published in the "Comments and Trends" columns each month, dealt with problems in communication. Readers realized that this field would present one of the major challenges to AAC and ACPRA as they merged their talents, objectives, and endeavors.

President Harold Enarson of Ohio State University sounded the challenge when he wrote in the first issue of the year: "Many Americans are no longer sure what universities are all about. Throughout the land there is a deep-rooted uneasiness about the higher learning. It is reflected in the questions of parents, the protests of students, the concerns of public officials, and the outcries of critics. . . . Ralph Waldo Emerson described our predicament: 'Having lost sight of our goals, we redouble our energies'. In so doing, we diminish our capacity for solving problems."[167]

Another president, James E. Perdue of State University College at Oswego, New York, put the situation bluntly when he said, "The heart of most university problems is weak communication. . . . Several studies of communication within colleges have led to a major conclusion: Good communication is seldom attained through large meetings or memoranda. Information does not assure understanding; communication develops understanding and imparts information as well. Understanding is the product of a relationship much deeper than merely informational. To achieve mutual understanding professionals need opportunity for intimate exchange and careful confrontation, in the course of considering issues. . . .

"The following statement of principle may oversimplify our problem, but I believe it will serve generally as a necessary frame of reference for the development of various approaches, each of which will add significantly to the problem's solution: The individual can only identify with and be loyal to that which he respects. The individual can respect only those things which he understands. The individual can understand only when he has freedom of inquiry and opportunity to dissent."[168]

In an article on "The Will to Communicate" David Landman, former director of information at the Harvard Business School, echoed the feelings of President Perdue.

"The strength of virtually every institution," he wrote, "depends today on the effectiveness with which its story is communicated, how much of its story, and to whom. And that effectiveness depends on the institution's will to communicate. . . .

"A failure to communicate hurts different institutions in different ways, but the likelihood of hurt is always high; the probability of avoiding hurt is low. For what every college lives on is its continuing good reputation within its set of definable communities. . . . What is important is to remember that no reputation is static; over time reputations tend to wear thin. . . . In our system of education, untended reputations run downhill and grow cold. The remedy is active, purposeful communication, the thoughtful infusion of new energy. The alternative is *reputation erosion*. . . .

"The will to communicate generates purposeful communication that is tuned to the college's publics, whether six men at dinner with the president at the University Club or sixty thousand in the football stadium. Such communication grabs people, informs them, touches their emotions as well as their minds, and produces action. That is what we all want."[169]

Writing on "Higher Education's Failure," Professor Charles S. Steinberg of Hunter College's Department of Communications blamed the failure of higher education to create a favorable climate of opinion on "lack of corporate enterprise devoted to public opinion research, to public information, and to the creative and intelligent use of the mass communications media."

"It would be simplistic," he asserted, "to attribute the financial erosion that has set in at so many colleges and universities solely to ineffectual public relations. But it would be equally naive to fail to recognize that this is a society where public consensus and legislative decision making are powerfully influenced by mass media. . . .

"Higher education—despite the presence of information officers on every campus, despite the publicity releases from the professional associations—has somehow managed to fail in arousing the public from its apathy and the government from its resistance toward a sympathetic recognition of the economic blight in the colleges and universities. . . . College administrators exhort press officers to arrange publicity stories . . . on pseudo-events which scarcely enhance the public's idea of a university. And faculty, who are in a position to contribute so effectively to public consesus, often dismiss public relations as unethical, manipulative, and demeaning to the proper image of an institution of higher education. Nor are the professional associations that represent higher education any more adept at creating a more favorable public opinion."

Professor Steinberg criticized universities for failure to develop "a seasoned corps of professional communicators." "Too many information officers," he charged, "are poorly trained, underpaid, and not armed with the management authority that is accorded their counterparts in industry. Few are qualified to develop research programs, to interpret findings, and to develop an active program to influence public opinion. . . . Former newspapermen, for example, have little background in the history or function of our system of higher education. There is inadequate communication between the information officer and the central administration and practically no communication with students and faculty—both of whom constitute superb instruments of positive public relations with the larger community. And there is small comprehension of the needs for visual material that would be acceptable to the television news and documentary producer."

Professor Steinberg held that the outlook "need not be hopeless"—that colleges and universities "offer a vast resource of newsworthy material for a skillful information officer."

"Translating this potential into positive grist for the media and the public, however, will require some reorientation of structure and function," he added. "The public relations function must be accepted by the faculty, not as manipulated propaganda, but as an honest, effective effort to create informed public opinion. The administration will have to discard its idea of the information officer as a messenger to the media and solicit—indeed encourage—his participation in the determination of policy. . . .

"The function of intelligently devised public information," Professor Steinberg concluded, "is to make public opinion articulate, to arouse favorable action, and to create consent. If the goals are clearly defined, if the message is dramatically structured for transmission to the media, it should be accepted and interpreted in a way that will move the recipient to constructive action."[170]

The failure of public relations in higher education institutions results from failure to understand the principles and procedures involved in its practice, wrote Professor Owen C. Elder, Jr., assistant dean for administration at the School of Community and Allied Health Resources of the University of Alabama. His article on "Communications Made Comprehensive" appeared in the final issue of the *Journal*.

"To many professors 'public relations' connotes 'propaganda'," he wrote, "and they resist it strongly as a legitimate function of an institution of higher education. Many students share the same view, thinking of the public relations officer as a sort of super 'used car salesman' for higher education. Although administrators embrace public relations as an essential administrative function of the college or university, they frequently think in terms of 'what they can get out of the public' through active programs of publicity and fund raising, or how they can smooth the 'ruffled feathers' when something distasteful to the public occurs involving the institution, its faculty, or its students.

"Public relations officers themselves often see their primary functions as 'fund raising, tub thumping, and fire fighting'. They are tempted to present an 'image' of how the institution ought to be instead of how it is; to look for and present only the good about the institution; to rely on the techniques of specific segments of public relations, such as publicity, instead of establishing broad public relations policy; and to compromise on fundamental issues for the sake of keeping peace and tranquillity."

To make communications comprehensive, the writer held, public relations must be given a broader role.

"Public relations," he continued, "should be the 'total program of interpretation of an institution and, more important, the performance of deeds by which the institution relates itself to the public'. The basic policies and practices of an institution must be designed to merit public acceptance and support or publicity will be of no avail. . . . Colleges and universities clearly need to include students and faculty as well as the public at large in their public relations programs. . . . A clear distinction must be made between the limited function of publicity and the very broad function of public relations in the minds of presidents, public relations officers, and faculty. Public relations in institutions of higher education *must* include more than publicity. . . . There must also be some mechanism whereby the institution can 'listen' to its publics. . . . Genuine communication requires 'participation' of all elements of the public. . . . There is a vital need in colleges and universities for the kind of communication that brings about between the institution and its publics a shared understanding of shared purpose. . . .

"Comprehensive communication or public relations in the broader sense of the term is essential to institutions of higher education," Professor Elder concluded. "The challenge to the leaders in education in the 1970s is to find the means whereby it can be accomplished."[171]

The last national conference of ACPRA, held in Atlanta, July 9-11, 1974, drew 812 registrants and some 200 guests, the total representing 503 institutions and forty-six states.[172] With Edwin Crawford as chairman of an advisory committee, detailed planning had started early. When the trustees met in December it was announced that major themes would be the erosion of public confidence in institutions, major issues in higher education, and who pays and who benefits. Norman C. Smith of Emory University was named conference chairman with Herman B. Smith, Jr., of the Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, as conference coordinator and Adelaide R. Snyder of Florida Atlantic University as associate coordinator.[173]

ACPRA's final award for distinguished service to higher education was presented to Asa S. Knowles, retiring president of Northeastern University, in recognition of his contributions to the federal work study program and to the advancement of cooperative education. The Frank Ashmore Award (formerly President's Citation) was presented to Michael Radock and Robert Rhodes in recognition of their leadership as cochairmen of the AAC/ACPRA Joint Study Committee.[174] In a surprise presentation, the Association awarded President John Leslie the crystal flame, symbolic of distinguished service to higher education.

Prizes totaling $6,000, made possible by foundation grants, were awarded in the largest National Honors Competition in the Association's history. Ford incentive grants of $500 each went to Georgetown University, Philadelphia College of Art, National Technical Institute for the Deaf at Rochester Institute of Technology, Randolph-Macon College, and Garland County (Arkansas) Community College. In a new division of the program, communications to prospective students, Aetna Life and Casualty awards of $1,000 and $500, respectively, went to Lawrence University and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. Awards of $250 each went to Hood College and Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge. Other major awards were $500 Weyerhaeuser incentive grants in the communications competition to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Colorado State University, and Coker College. A total of sixteen certificates of exceptional achievement and 149 certificates of merit were also awarded in the various categories of the honors program.[175]

Guiding ACPRA in 1973-74 as chairman of the Board of Trustees was John Callahan. Edwin Crawford praised the Amherst administrator for his leadership during this, "one of the most demanding and difficult in our fifty-seven-year history."

"He brought to the task a decisive and no-nonsense approach that made certain the business of the Association was realistically and expeditiously handled," Crawford declared. "His keen New England wit and quick grasp of any problem gave the Association a persuasive and effective leader."[176]

During Callahan's administration ACPRA had maintained strength in both membership and finances while carrying on its programs and services and progressing toward merger. Membership on the eve of merger was 1,331 institutions and 3,502 individuals.[177] Income for the year had totaled $556,054 compared to expenses of $469,683. The Association had contributed $66,680 toward expenses of the Joint Study Committee and $52,924 for those of the organizing board. Assets stood at $469,759.[178]

At a speech in Atlanta, Crawford said, "Let's look at the potential [the future] while remembering the best of ACPRA's past. Merger is a good idea whose time has come. All of you can take pride in having carried the idea to this threshold. As the door to the future opens, we must rededicate ourselves and our unified new association to building public confidence and support for the institutions we are privileged to represent. I thank you for letting me be the doorkeeper at the outset of this historic and exciting moment in the life of AAC/ACPRA."[179]

The spirit of merger manifest as the delegates returned to their homes and offices was well described by the words used earlier by the editor of ACPRA *News*: "We have in the making a new force in advancing postsecondary education with a potential of such magnitude that one is restless with anticipation and eager with ideas for the early life of the heir to AAC/ACPRA."[180]

New Name, New Promise, New Resolution

September 1, 1974, arrived and ACPRA and AAC, as authorized by their members, were beginning to operate as a new organization under the title AAC/ACPRA. Much remained to be done, however, before the unification was complete. The IRS had yet to act upon the new organization's application for tax-exempt status, an action needed to make AAC/ACPRA "legal." Boundary lines for the unified districts were yet to be determined. The new president had to be named—and the new name for the unified organization determined. Meanwhile, planning for programs "sensitized to the needs of the membership," as promised by Board Chairman Edwin Crawford in his memorandum to members of the parent organizations on June 25, had to be done more comprehensively that in any past year.

To assure executive direction after John Leslie resigned in August, Cletis Pride, director of ACPRA's Research-Reference Center since 1970, and one of the half dozen staff members who had worked closely with the Joint Study Committee and organizing board during the past year, served as executive assistant to Crawford. He then became interim president early in September.[181]

Even before he assumed his new title, Pride was able to report that many of the housekeeping chores essential in unification, such as organizing central files, integrating membership lists, the libraries and phone systems, establishing internal controls on expenditures, and planning promotions for expanded programs and services had been completed or were well under way.[182]

In a letter to members mailed September 4, Crawford described the care being taken by the Search Committee to make certain the new organization would get for its president an individual completely fitted for the job. Nearly 150 persons had applied for the post and more than seventy-five additional nominations had been received. A representative of the Academy for Educational Development in Washington had been retained as a consultant to the committee which now hoped to have recommendations by October. Chicago had been chosen as the site for the first national conference of the new organization and Bernice Poutas of Simmons College would be the conference chairperson.

September 23, 1974, was a red-letter day for AAC/ACPRA. Meeting in Washington on that day, the Board of Trustees unanimously accepted the nomination of Alice L. Beeman, presented with the unanimous support of the Search and Executive Committees, to become the first president of the new organization. She would assume the post on December 1.

For the past five years Miss Beeman had served as the chief executive of the American Association of University Women, which was composed of more than 900 institutional and 180,000 individual members in some 1,800 branches across the country. At AAUW headquarters in Washington she was responsible for a staff of eighty-nine and an annual budget of $1.4 million. She was also the chief executive of the AAUW Educational Foundation with assets of $13 million.

Miss Beeman ,was well acquainted with AAC and ACPRA. She had been a member of the latter for twenty-two years while serving successively as news service assistant, special publications editor, director of publications, and director of information services at the University of Michigan. She had been a member of the Association's Board of Directors from 1950 to 1953, first as associate editor, then editor of *College Public Relations Quarterly*. At Michigan she had had administrative responsibility for a staff of twenty in the news service and publications office in her last position as director of information services.

"She is knowledgeable of our institutions, experienced in our profession, and keenly aware of the needs and opportunities facing American education in the years ahead," Crawford said in his memorandum.

Michael Radock, Miss Beeman's last "boss" at Michigan, summed up her qualifications with the comment, "She is one of the most competent professionals in our field. She is an experienced communicator, a person of sound judgment, persuasive ability, and tremendous energy."

In a brief acceptance speech Miss Beeman stressed the "need to build pride in the membership and in achieving a unified association and a unified profession," promised to work with the staff in bringing about "the services and programs that you want and that education needs from us," and pledged "the best I have in ideas, in energy, and in plain hard work."[183]

The long-awaited IRS approval of AAC/ACPRA as a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization under its temporary name, or whatever name it might eventually choose, was announced on September 23.[184]

At that day's meeting the trustees also voted to fill the recently-created office of chairman-elect-designate of the board and elected Dwight V. Roberts to the position. By this action Roberts, executive director of the University of Colorado Foundation, would become chairman of the board in 1976, succeeding Wesley E. Bevins, Jr.[185]

Boundaries merging ACPRA's nine districts and AAC's eight were determined by the trustees on September 23. The new organization would have eight districts: I. New England—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut; II. Middle Atlantic—New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, District of Columbia, and Maryland; III. Southeastern—Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi; IV. Southwest—Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona; V. Great Lakes—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; VI. Mid-America—Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Wyoming, and Colorado; VII. Far West—California, Nevada, Utah, and Hawaii; VIII. Northwest—Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho. Arizona later petitioned for transfer to the Far West District. Mexico would be included in the Southwest District and the Canadian provinces in the districts they adjoined. The new boundaries, with district meetings already scheduled for 1974-75, would not become effective until the end of the interim year.

In addition to the general objectives of the national organization, the chief purposes of the districts were: "to encourage volunteer involvement and leadership in Association activities; to better insure delivery of continuing education programs to members; to maintain communications with the national organization as to the needs and aspirations of the district membership; and to promote intradistrict programs and services."[186]

Under the direction of John Bennett, vice president of the former ACPRA and now a vice president of the new organization, AAC/ACPRA by October had launched an ambitious conference program to promote better relations with the various constituencies.

The first of these conferences was on international alumni affairs. Held in Washington on October 1-3, it brought together seventy-six alumni officers, foreign students, international alumni, representatives of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, State Department representatives, and others in the field to discuss record-keeping problems, model programs, and involvement of international alumni in programs sponsored by alumni associations.

Since 1945, more than a million foreign students had attended colleges and universities in the United States. Many of them had returned to their own countries afterwards and assumed positions of importance. The vast majority of these were now "lost" and receiving no benefits from alumni programs. Members of the conference formulated these opinions: "International alumni need and want more contact with their American alma maters; an audience which has great potential is not being served effectually, and the dream of one world could become more than a far-fetched concept within a decade."[187] The success of the Washington conference and the work of an ad hoc committee prompted the Executive Committee of the organizing board to recognize in November an International Alumni Committee as a permanent committee of the board.[188]

Indicating the broadened interests and impact of the new organization, other conferences planned for the year would consider: "The Alumni Fund," "Support for the Independent School," "Mini-Media for Mini-Money," "Governmental Affairs," "Corporation and Foundation Support," "Communications Programs for Student Recruitment," "Marketing a Deferred Gifts Program," "Managing the Alumni Program," "Alumni Travel Programs," and "Graphics

200" (concerning all facets of publications work, direct mail, and advertising). In addition to these and the national conference [assembly], three summer institutes were scheduled—on "Alumni Administration," "Communications," and "Educational Fund Raising."[189]

The trustees had hoped that a new magazine could be started in 1974-75 to replace *College and University Journal* and *Alma Mater*. Instead, *Interim*, which had appeared first during the summer, continued monthly until October when *Techniques* was resumed. For the remainder of the interim year the two publications appeared in alternate months with *Dateline Washington* and *Education Abstracts*, two former publications, as feature sections. The new periodical, to contain "all the information appearing in present publications plus some additional features" would not be started until the fall of 1975.[190]

Among the articles which member representatives found most useful in the early days of the merged organization were two appearing in the October issue of *Techniques*. In one of these Charles E. Smith, presidential assistant at the University of Tennessee, presented a ten-point plan for improving the image of higher education. This, he said, would entail: (1) personalizing the institution; (2) clarifying the job market; (3) underscoring the value of a college education; (4) characterizing the student; (5) spotlighting continuing education; (6) emphasizing the public service; (7) defining accountability; (8) humanizing the faculty; (9) analyzing the student mood; and (10) interpreting enrollment trends.

Smith contended that continuing education "is one of the major untold stories of higher educating." In discussing "characterizing the student" he said, "We need to update the image of the 'typical' student. Recruiting brochures should include pictures of the forty-five-year-old housewife and the sixty-five-year-old grandfather, and the copy should reflect the changing characteristics of today's students. News bureau staffs should seek out 'older' students as potential feature sources and develop a coordinated series of news releases around these new consumers."

"Defining accountability" was held by Smith to be one of the most important jobs of institutions working to improve their images. Declaring that some people were questioning the need for additional capital development and others were regarding colleges and universities as "fat cats," wasteful of their funds, Smith wrote, "It is time for the institutions to respond to these concerns with a positive public relations program that spotlights efforts to achieve efficiencies in operations, states clearly the need for additional resources, and defends forcefully the expenditures.

"If an institution has a program designed to evaluate its personnel, the public relations office should promote it. If the university has a management consultant reviewing operations and recommending economy measures, the public relations office should promote it. If a university has cut back on publications, travel, or other operations, the public relations office should promote it. And if a university is *not* doing these things, its administration deserves the criticism being leveled at it."[191]

In the second article, titled "Ten Commandments for Successful Development," President Arvin Hahn of Bethany College (Kansas) advocated principles and discipline as the keys for perserving the "qualities that are the heart and soul of the enterprise." His ten commandments:

> I. *You shall administer your office with a genuine respect for the human qualities of the persons within your organization*. . . .
>
> II. *You shall provide responsible leadership and foster the betterment of work and leadership qualities among members of your staff*. . . . Responsible leadership demands honesty and openness, its goal being to achieve results through understanding and not through power. Such leadership requires good teaching, model action, and consistent 'above-board' practices.
>
> III. *You shall foster improved morale, realizing it to be indispensable to university development*. . . . Fostering improved morale requires a correct understanding of its present conditions and insight into its integral parts. It requires an open and extensive review of the alternate remedies and a plan of action. Ultimately, however, it requires a 'building together' attitude with less concern about who gets the credit. Fair treatment and truthful answers are a good way to begin.

High morale is contagious. It tends to override petty bickerings and to maximize the institution's strength. Students and staff tend to see institutional goals as partially accomplished rather than as partial failure. Retention rates improve. Students recruit students and the outside publics regenerate their sometimes flagging interest.

IV. *You shall continually engage in telling your publics what your college is not as well as what it is.* . . . Credibility will depend on the truthfulness of one's statements about services the college provides. No college can be 'all things to all people'. To 'tell it like it is' is not only to gather respect but also to increase following and support for your program. To do otherwise is to err grieviously and to negate the potential for significant fruitful development. . . . So assert clearly your strengths and be creditable in your oral and published statements.

V. *You shall convince youth and older people of the value of your creed of higher education.* . . . You need to establish clearly and express succinctly a creed of higher education for your college. Clear, simple, understandable, statements of your institutional distinctiveness are indispensable.

These should include a clear and valid rationale about how the community, national, and world environs may be benefited by your college. . . . The marketing of higher education is most competitive and you must be prepared to engage in that complex task. Evidence of your success in this regard can be measured in terms of the amount and quality of debate you can promote in the market place, as well as your student recruitment, and gifts and grants statistics.

VI. *You shall seek and realize the best possible institutional qualities before you move among your various off-campus publics.* . . . You must know your campus community well before you can articulate its specific areas of development to alumni, friends, corporations, and foundations some distance away. . . . Remember that your effectiveness in off-campus promotion is not likely to outstride the gains being registered at home.

VII. *You shall proceed among your outside publics, progressing from those most easily identifiable and nearer, to those more remote.* . . . Too many administrators are premature in their travels to far-off foundations and other granting agencies, showing little more than travel weariness and big expense accounts for their efforts. A well-established record of prior success among local, sympathetic sources can pave the way for later success farther afield. . . . Your pattern of action, except for alumni and parents, might follow a 'concentric circle' theory, beginning with the home community and moving into increasingly distant locales.

VIII. *You shall understand the need for the active involvement of top leadership to secure sufficient students and sufficient funds.* Meeting today's institutional needs requires maximum concerted attention. Not only is good management expected from top leadership; so is direct involvement in fund raising, especially in cases of potentially significant contributions. Ordinarily, large givers want association with the president. . . . Such special attention should be under the guidance of the development director or the dean of admissions. As the institution grows and prospers, such guidance should show increasingly discriminating selectivity for the involvement of top leadership but not necessarily less time expenditure on their part.

IX. *You shall recognize the potentially significant roll of nonpaid personnel in the attainment of goals.* No college can afford to have only paid personnel to achieve its goals. . . . Among the unpaid people for potentially valuable service are trustees who by their very relationship to the institution may become natural assistants. Select alumni, with their more intimate knowledge of the college, are good prospects both for student recruitment and placement of new graduates. So are parents and clergy. Too often forgotten is the student who can relate the true nature of the institution to his own age group.

X. *You shall accept gifts for purposes compatible with those of the institution and reject those that promote programs not consistent with your goals or beliefs about the nature and purpose of higher education.* . . . Accepting gifts not consistent with your college policy can be costly. For example, it can lead to excessive construction and therefore an unanticipated increase in operational costs. More seriously, it presents the possibility of an unconscious swerving from your creed. In the long term this could upset morale or, even worse, foster ideologies inconsistent with your philosophical concepts. Receiving gifts of this nature then could upset the normal flow of assistance from knowledgeable and sympathetic contributors.

"In today's 'money-crunch' world, abstinence from these pitfalls is increasingly difficult. Today's leadership in higher education therefore requires persons of exceptional principles and discipline. For it is people of just such principles and discipline who will preserve the qualities of human respectability, qualities that are the heart and soul of the enterprise."[192]

At a meeting in Houston on November 25-26 the Executive Committee revised the budget slightly and made three decisions of major importance.

The first major decision set the size of the permanent Board of Trustees at twenty-eight: six officers, six members representing functional areas, eight district trustees, up to six members at large, and two lay members. The president would be a member *ex officio*. From a slate presented by a Nominating Committee member representatives of the organization would elect the chairman-elect-designate, the secretary, the six functional area representatives, and in each third year a treasurer. The districts would each elect one trustee. The lay members and the members at large would be chosen by the Board of Trustees from a slate prepared by the Nominating Committee.

A new policy for selecting national assembly sites was determined by the Executive Committee. It called for the division of the continental United States into three zones, with a six-year rotation of sites to provide for an assembly in the most easterly Zone A every other year, two of the remaining three meetings in mid-states Zone B, and one meeting in six in westerly Zone C. The plan also called for an assembly in Washington every fourth year.[193]

Third, and most important, a new name was chosen. After Robert Rhodes requested in the September *Interim* that members submit suggestions to the Name Committee, nearly 160 flowed in to add to the 400 or so previously in hand. Not until late November was the committee able to narrow the possibilities to four. Previously it had agreed unanimously not to consider names which used the words "higher" [in front of education], "college," "university," "American," or "national." The committee also felt that the new name should not conflict, either in full or in initials, with that of any other educational organization; that it should be easy to say, either in full or by initials; that it should not specifically mention any or all of the professional areas served by the organization; that it be sufficiently broad to cover all of those areas. The committee also decided that the word "council" was preferable to "association" and all four of the names under consideration began with "Council."

The committee finally decided unanimously to recommend to the Executive Committee and to the Board of Trustees the name, "Council for Advancement and Support of Education" (CASE). "CASE is what every member does, that is, makes the case for support," the committee said in its report. "CASE/EDUCATION is a single visual statement of mission. CASE can also explain the basic functional goals of the members: Communicate, Administrate, Solicit Support, and Educate."[194]

At its Houston meeting the Executive Committee was unanimous in its support of the name suggested. In a mail vote the Board of Trustees early in December concurred with only two dissenting votes.

By the end of December the names of AAC and ACPRA had disappeared from among those of the forty-two institutions now housed in the National Center for Higher Education. In their place, but farther down in the listing, was Council for Advancement and Support of Higher Education.

At about the same time the first annual *Membership Directory* appeared. It revealed that the new organization had almost reached expectations for its first year. The organization already had 1,928 member institutions with 6,652 member representatives. Three hundred forty-two of the member institutions and 602 of the member representatives were from independent secondary schools. In addition, CASE listed seventy-two educational associates—nonprofit, education-related organizations, with 150 individual representatives and fifty-two subscribers, and commercial enterprises whose activites complemented those of CASE, with 113 individual representatives. Thus the total membership in all categories included 2,052 institutions, associations, and commercial enterprises and 6,915 individuals.

International memberships included seventy-four institutions and 160 individuals. Of these eight institutions and nine member representatives were included in the independent schools classification. The internationals came from twenty countries and one commonwealth: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, England, Ethiopia, Greece, Guam, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nicaragua, Philippines, Puerto Rico, South Africa, Spain, Venezuela, and West Indies.[195]

The rationale for the new name was fully explained in the first 1975 issue of *Interim*. "Trying to include the interests of a variety of members in the ingredients of the name became a futile task for the Name Committee," read the report. "Their logical procedure was to eliminate the suggestions that were parochial or that contained problem words. *College*, of course, doesn't include the independent schools; *American* seems to exclude the Canadians and the international members; titles with *Alumni* most times exclude the six other major professional functions; combinations of professional function titles resulted in gobbledegook. . . . So the solution was to turn from our modest differences to our common goals.

"The word *Council* describes well our collection of institutions and serves better than *Association* because it reflects the 'plurality' of institutions sharing common goals but with distinctive profiles and problems. *Advancement* includes in its scope not only the total welfare of education and each institution, but the specific roles of our organization in fostering the professional progress of each individual member and the lifelong education of alumni throughout the country and elsewhere. *Support* specifies the unique thrust of our organization in terms of intellectual, moral, and financial assistance from alumni and all our publics. Other councils work for general advancement or specific financial support, but we pledge ourselves to the dual roles."[196]

Selection of the new name completed the merger process. The Board of Trustees and the national office staff, now numbering twenty-two persons,[197] dedicated themselves to fulfilling the sixteen *we wills* promised by the Joint Study Committee and trustees of the preceding year as they explored the potentials inherent in merger. Their pledge then had been

We will promote unity, responsiveness, and openness to a complex constituency which must cope with a changing society and with changing demands in educational institutions.

We will assist the professional development of our members and will search for new ways to improve professional growth.

We will provide training programs for new professionals and extensive career development programs for the experienced members.

We will establish codes of professional ethics and a structure for professional accreditation.

We will maintain high professional standards and honor superior achievement by individuals and institutions.

We will generate research specifically designed to improve professional development and to answer the needs of our members and institutions.

We will respond to the special needs of the diverse elements in our membership and avoid domination by any one particular interest or institutional group.

We will preserve the volunteer spirit throughout the organization.

We will govern within a structure which reflects the professional, the institutional and the regional interests and concerns.

We will strengthen district and regional programming to encourage greater member participation and provide useful services and programs.

We will create a legal structure which provides functional stability and permits adaptation to the demands of changing times.

We will function in a more participatory and democratic system with a greater involvement of members at all levels.

We will continue and further develop sound relationships between educational institutions and their various constituencies.

We will seek to create better dialogue with the outside constituencies and other educational and governmental organizations.

We will proceed with a unity of purpose and goals for the benefit of each individual and the progress of each institution in the new organization.

We will intensify our efforts to advance understanding and support of education."[198]

Truly, the world of college relations had changed since that little group of twenty-five huddled in a Chicago hotel on April 6, 1917, and organized the American Association of College News Bureaus.

And the future will be new history.

Acknowledgments

A book of this kind becomes possible only with the help of many people and the author has received the ready cooperation of scores of individuals, some supplying information, some checking facts, some helping to prepare the manuscript.

Back in the 1950s, William G. Wilcox of Ohio State University endeavored to produce a history of ACPRA by securing from each past president a 2,500-word summary of his administration. Through no fault of his, Wilcox was unable to complete the project, but those materials he was able to accumulate proved quite valuable in the writing of this history.

Fourteen past presidents—T. T. Frankenberg (1917-1920), Bristow Adams (1920-1921), Nelson Antrim Crawford (1921-1922), William P. Kirkwood (1922-1925), Maynard W. Brown (1927-1928), Ralph S. Clark (1928-1929), Edmund S. Carpenter (1929-1930), Earl Reed Silvers (1930-1931), Louis C. Boochever (1931-1933), Robert W. Madry (1933-1934), Robert X. Graham (1938-1939), J. Willard Ridings (1941-1942), Harold Ellis (1942-1943), and Stewart Harral (1950-1951)—were deceased by the time this history was started in 1967. All past presidents then living, and those who have served as presidents or board chairmen since that date, have cooperated wholeheartedly by supplying material, tracking down information, and suggesting additional sources.

Four members of the national office staff—John W. Leslie, John E. Bennett, Nancy Shackelford and Virginia Carter—also gave invaluable help during the eight years this work was in progress.

More than sixty-five individuals, most of them relatives, associates, or friends of past presidents, also cooperated in some manner. The author is happy to list them here as an evidence of his deep appreciation: Theodore T. Frankenberg, Jr., Baldwin, N.Y.; Rodney A. Frankenberg, Pittsburgh; Gypsy Bell Frankenberg Adam, Nashua, N.H.; Arnaud C. Marts and George E. Lundy, New York City; William B. Ward and John Marcham, Cornell University; Mrs. Nelson Antrim Crawford, Topeka, Kan.; Max. W. Milbourn, Kansas State University; William L. Nunn and William T. Harris, University of Minnesota; Ralph O. Nafziger, University of Wisconsin; Robert E. McCarthy and David J. Foran, Marquette University; Ellenor Tallmadge and Charles M. Davis, Case Western Reserve University; Willard N. James, Hollins College; Denton Beal and John O'Connor, Carnegie-Mellon University; Marshall W. Henry and Pete Ivey, University of North Carolina; Charles E. Flynn, University of Illinois; Bernie Conway, Harry A. Dolphin, and Michael Byrne, Creighton University; Frances Van Bussum and Mary Lyle Weeks, University of Florida; Joyce G. Endejann, Esther Parker, and Claire Young, University of Cincinnati; Helen Knox, University of Pittsburgh; Mrs. John J. Mahoney, Winchester, Mass.; Norman M. Bryden, Boston University; Paul O. Ridings and James L. Lehman, Texas Christian University; Ray Colvig, University of California, Berkeley; Adolph Mayer, University of Denver; W. R. Simmons, New York University; John Stempel, Earl M. Hoff, William Spencer, and Robert Mossholder, Indiana University; Cleland B. Wyllie, University of Michigan; Buford Gordon, Vanderbilt University; William Keys, University of Texas; Quentin L. Ault, Tulane University; President Theodore A. Distler and Leo Geier, Franklin and Marshall College; M. Eugene Hannum and George Crudden, Lancaster, Pa.; Al Spiers, Nixon Newspapers; Baaron B. Pittenger, Harvard University; John A. Moser, Xavier University; James A. Martin, Marshall University; Gordon B. Strayer, University of Iowa; W. Chestley Worthington and James Calogero, Brown University; James A. Ross, DePaul University; Edward D. Aebischer, Amherst College; Edward J. Zabrusky and W. Lowell Treaster, Michigan State University; Charles H. Dick and James R. DeSantis, State University of New York at Buffalo; Mrs. Dyar Massey, Atlanta, Ga.; James E. Murphy, University of Notre Dame, and Samuel M. Sharkey, Jr., Federal Communications Commission.

Four members of the Wittenberg University staff also deserve my thanks—Barbara

Johnson, my former secretary who helped with the typing, and Luella Eutsler, Rita Harnish, and Vera Auten of the Thomas Library staff, who gave generously of their time to check references.

Lastly, I give sincere thanks to my wife, Hazel, without whose help this book could not have been completed. She gave me moral support, typed most of the manuscript, and helped in numerous other ways over the eight years and especially during the final days of checking facts and reference notes.

W. Emerson Reck
October 1, 1975

Sources of Information

As might be expected, most of the information for this book came from the publications and files of the American College Public Relations Association and its predecessor organizations. In the case of publications, it should be noted that names changed frequently, and that in some cases the same name was used at different times for different types of publication; for instance, *Publicity Problems* during one period for the annual convention proceedings, at a later time for the Association magazine. Spellings, such as newsletter, were also different at different times.

To make checking as easy as possible for those readers wishing more complete information, sources of information are listed as follows:

Association Publications:

Newsletters

Association of College News Bureaus (1922)
Bulletin of AACNB (1922)
Occasional News Letter (1923)
AACNB Correspondence Clinic (1926-1927)
Newsletter of AACNB (1928-1930)
Ink Slings (1930-1936)
ACPRA News Letter (1949-1956)
ACPRA Newsletter (1961-1972)
ACPRA News (1972-1974)

Magazines

College Publicity Digest (1936-1942)
Publicity Problems (1942-1946)
College Public Relations (1946-1949)
College Public Relations Quarterly (1949-1956)
Pride (1957-1961)
College and University Journal (1962-1974)
Interim (Published by AAC/ACPRA, 1974, and Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1975)

Convention Proceedings and Annual Reports

Publicity for Colleges and Universities (1923)
College and University News Bureaus (1924-1928)
College and University Publicity (1929)
ACPA Convention Report (1930-1935)
Publicity Problems (1936-1942)
Publicity Digest (1943-1944)
College Public Relations Annual (1946-1948)
College Public Relations Quarterly (Program features only, 1949-1955)
Membership Directory and Annual Reports (1952-1960 and 1964-1967)
Annual Report (1961-1962, 1963, 1971-1973)
Report from 1962 Annual Meeting
Report to Members (1968-1970)

Other Association publications

Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education (Greenbrier Conference Report), 1958
Education Abstracts (1963-1974)
Postwar Education in American Colleges and Universities, by Arthur L. Brandon, 1944
Techniques (1966-1975)

Other Association Sources:

AAC/ACPRA File. Material covering relations between AAC and ACPRA, most of it related to steps leading to the merger of 1974.

Historical File. Manuscript copies of chapters past presidents wrote in 1950s along with several historical sketches not used in this history.

Presidential Files. Biographical material, addresses, letters, memos, reports, newspaper clippings, etc., of past presidents (1917-1973) and board chairmen 1973-1975).

Reports. Those of boards, commissions, committees, councils, and sections not found in Association publications.

Other Sources:

College and University Publicity, by Earl F. Reinke, unpublished Master of Science thesis, Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, 1937

The American College Public Relations Association: a Study of Its Development During the Period 1915 to 1950, by M. Charles Seller, Master of Arts thesis, Graduate School of Journalism,, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

WWJ Broadcasting 'Firsts', WWJ, Detroit, undated.

Books, magazines, and newspapers as mentioned in the Reference Notes.

Reference Notes

For the sake of easy reference in the future, material of historical value, such as addresses, letters, memoranda, magazine articles, and newspaper releases, when not found in publications of the Association, has been assembled in files under the names of presidents (1917-1973) and chairmen of the board (1973-1975). Any reference to a president's manuscript, however, refers to that president's chapter in the manuscript history of ACPRA and will be found in the Association's history file. Letters to the author concerning presidents have been placed in the files of the individuals to whom they pertain. Reports of Association committees and organizational divisions, such as the Executive Committee and Administrative Section, when they do not appear in publications, have been assembled in the archives, filed by the committees or divisions in question. They have been assigned abbreviations in the list below along with other most frequently used references. Abbreviations for the principal references are listed below:

AACNB:	American Association of College News Bureaus
ACNB:	*Association of College News Bureaus*
ACPA:	American College Publicity Association
ACPRA:	American College Public Relations Association
AP:	Associated Press
AR:	*Annual Reports*
AUSHE:	*Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education*
BD:	Board of Directors
BT:	Board of Trustees
CASE:	Council for Advancement and Support of Education
CC:	*AACNB Correspondence Clinic*
CoSIDA:	College Sports Information Directors Association
COTP:	Committee on Taxation and Philanthropy
CPD:	*College Publicity Digest*
CPR:	*College Public Relations*
CPRA:	*College Public Relations Annual*
CPRQ:	*College Public Relations Quarterly*
CR:	*ACPA Convention Report*
CUJ:	*College and University Journal*
CUNB:	*College and University News Bureaus*
CUP:	*College and University Publicity*
EA:	*Education Abstracts*
EC:	Executive Committee
FC:	Finance Committee
IS:	*Ink Slings*
JLC:	Joint Liaison Committee
JSC:	Joint Study Committee
LC:	Liaison Committee
MD:	*Membership Directory*
MS:	Medical Section
NL:	*Newsletter*
NEWS:	*ACPRA News*
OBd:	Organizing Board
ONL:	*Occasional News Letter*
PCU:	*Publicity for Colleges and Universities*
PDCR:	*Publicity Digest Convention Report*
PP:	*Publicity Problems*
PPCR:	*Publicity Problems Convention Report*
RTM:	*Report to Members*
SC:	Study Committee (1957); Study Commission (1960)
SS:	Sports Section
TECH:	*Techniques*
TTF:	T. T. Frankenberg
WC:	Wells Commission

1. The Early Years

1. A. C. Marts to author, Sept. 2, 1966; Columbus *Dispatch Magazine*, May 12, 1974.
2. Karl B. Pauly, "Mostly About People," *Ohio State Journal*, May 8, 1942.
3. Ibid.
4. Marts to author, Sept. 2, 1966.
5. Pauly, "Mostly About People."
6. Ibid.
7. Al Getchell, "Sketchelltrait," Columbus *Citizen*, May 6, 1942.
8. "The Passing of a Reporter," *Ohio State Journal*, July 29, 1958.
9. Ibid.
10. CPD, April 1942, p.15.
11. "The Passing of a Reporter," *Ohio State Journal*.

12. Marts and Lundy *Staff Reporter*, Aug. 20, 1958.
13. L. W. Robey to A. C. Marts, Sept. 2, 1966.
14. CPD, April 1942, p.15.
15. TTF ms.
16. J. P. Gavits to TTF, Dec. 14, 1915.
17. TTF ms.
18. Reinke, pp.135-136; CUP 1929, p.25.
19. TTF file.
20. TTF ms.
21. PPCR 1942, p.16.
22. TTF ms.
23. Ibid; Reinke, p.138
24. CPD, April 1942, p.15.
25. TTF ms and letters to Robert H. Tucker, April 18, 1917, and Earl R. Trangmar, Feb. 5, 1918; also notices to trade publications.
26. CPD, April 1942, p.16.
27. Chicago *Evening American*, Jan. 3, 1920, as quoted in TTF ms.
28. Release to trade journals, TTF file.
29. Sobel promotion letter, May 4, 1917.
30. TTF ms.
31. Reinke, pp.139-140.
32. TTF to Earl R. Trangmar, Feb. 5, 1918.
33. CUP 1929, p.25; Reinke, p.140.
34. PPCR 1942, p.15.
35. CUP 1925, pp.27-28.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Reinke, p.141; Seller, p.4.
39. Reinke, p.143.
40. Ibid, p.144.
41. Lee A. White to TTF, Jan. 19, 1917.
42. Convention addresses, Jan. 2-3, 1920.
43. Ibid.
44. Reinke, p.147.
45. CPD, April 1942, p.16.
46. John Stempel to author June 27, 1968.
47. J. W. Cravens' address with TTF memo to AACNB members.
48. Adams, "The Ethics of Publicity," ms copy.
49. TTF to Adams, Oct. 12, 1920.
50. Adams, "Publicity—Its Uses and Abuses," AACNB convention report, Dec. 29-30, 1920.
51. AACNB convention report, Dec. 29-30, 1920.
52. Josef F. Wright to TTF, Oct. 13, 1920, and reply.
53. TTF address, mimeographed supplement to convention report, Dec. 29-30, 1920.
54. Reinke, p.150.
55. Ibid, pp.150-151.
56. Ibid, pp.152-153.
57. ACNB, Jan.-Feb. 1922.
58. N. A. Crawford file; *Who's Who in America*; Vol. 27, p.545.
59. Reinke, pp.153-154.
60. ONL, Jan. 1923.
61. Reinke, p.154.
62. *Minnesota Press*, June 1956, p.7.
63. Kirkwood ms.
64. ACNB, Jan.-Feb. 1922.

2. Growing Pains

1. Kirkwood ms.
2. Ibid, p.3.
3. Ibid, p.4; also PCU 1923.
4. Kirkwood ms; PCU 1923, p.41.
5. Kirkwood ms.
6. PCU 1923, p.41.
7. Kirkwood ms.
8. Reinke, pp.158-159.
9. CUNB 1924, pp.3-4.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid, pp.43-45.
12. Kirkwood ms.
13. CUNB 1925, p.10.
14. Ibid, p.6.
15. Ibid, p.13.
16. Ibid, pp.15-16.
17. Ibid, p.36.
18. Kirkwood ms; CUNB 1925, pp.38-40.
19. Ibid, p.36.
20. Ibid, p.3.
21. Ibid, p.5.
22. Elliott to Howard S. Curtis, undated.
23. CUNB 1926, pp.2-4.
24. Elliott sketch of his administration, 1951.
25. CUNB 1926, p.5.
26. Elliott sketch.
27. WWJ Broadcast "Firsts," undated.
28. CUNB 1926, pp.29-33.
29. Ibid, pp.6,15.
30. Elliott ms.
31. CUNB 1926, p.17.
32. ACPRA archives.
33. TTF to Trangmar, Feb. 5, 1918.
34. CUNB 1927, p.5.
35. Ibid, p.41.
36. Stempel letter accompanying convention report.
37. CUNB 1927, p.7.
38. Ibid, p.31.
39. Ibid, pp.4-6.
40. *Marquette Tribune*, Nov. 7, 1929; April 15, 1937.
41. CUNB 1928, p.6.
42. CC, Nov. 15, 1927.
43. CUNB 1928, pp.8,10.
44. Ibid, pp.16,18; Seller, p.17.
45. CUNB 1928, p.24.
46. Ibid, p.34.
47. Ibid, p.19.
48. Ibid, p.22.
49. Ibid, pp.47-51.
50. Ibid, p.38.
51. Ibid, pp.53-55.
52. Ibid, pp.71-74.
53. Ibid, pp.4-6.
54. NL, April 21, 1928.
55. CUNB 1928, p.4.
56. Ibid, p.74.

57. Ibid, p.66.
58. Ellenor Tallmadge to author, Jan. 25, 1968.
59. NL, April 3, 1929.
60. Ibid, March 2, 1929.
61. CUP 1929, p.2.
62. Ibid, pp.8-9.
63. Ibid, pp.10-19.
64. Ibid, pp.22-23.
65. Ibid, pp.35-37.
66. Ibid, p.46.
67. Ibid, p.49.
68. Ibid, pp.55-56.
69. Ibid, p.5.
70. Ibid, pp.5-6.
71. Ibid, p.63.
72. NL, Sept. 1929.
73. Milwaukee *Journal*, Sept. 2, 1965.
74. "Time Out for Talk," Milwaukee *Journal*, May 3, 1966.
75. NL, Dec. 31, 1929.
76. Ibid, March 1930.
77. NL supplement, Dec. 1929, and Jan. 1930.
78. NL, April 3, 1930.
79. Ibid, April 28, 1930.
80. Journal of NEA, Feb. 1930, pp.37-38.
81. CR 1930, pp.21-22.
82. Ibid, pp.43-45.
83. Ibid, pp.60-64.
84. Bulletin 23, Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, p.283.
85. CR 1930, pp.90-102.
86. Ibid, pp.75-89.
87. Ibid, p.11.
88. *Gotham Daily Seabreeze*, p.1.
89. NL, May 28, 1930.
90. CR 1930, p.14.
91. Ibid, p.7.
92. CPD, Oct. 1939, p.19; *Rutgers Alumni Monthly*, March 1948, pp.7-16.
93. IS, Sept.-Oct. 1931, p.1.
94. CR 1931, p.13.
95. Henry L. Herbert, unpublished ms, "The Term of Earl Reed Silvers."
96. IS, Sept.-Oct. 1930, pp.1-4.
97. Ibid, Nov. 1930, p.1; Feb. 23, 1931, p.2.
98. Ibid, p.3; April 1, 1931; CR 1931, p.94.
99. Ibid, p.11.
100. Ibid, pp.16-18.
101. Ibid, pp.19, 20.
102. Bulletin 26, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, p.27.
103. CR 1931, p.34.
104. Ibid, pp.35-40.
105. Ibid, pp.23-24.
106. IS, June 30, 1931, p.7.
107. CR, 1931, p.19.

3. New Challenges Emerge

1. IS, Sept. 28, 1931, pp.1-2.
2. CPD, Jan. 1940, pp.22-23.
3. IS, Nov. 30, 1931, p.1.
4. Ibid, pp.1-4.
5. Ibid, Dec. 31, 1931, pp.1-5.
6. Ibid, Feb. 29, 1932, p.1.
7. Ibid, Nov. 30, 1932, p.1.
8. Ibid, Jan. 29, 1932, p.7.
9. Ibid, Nov. 30, 1932, pp.1-3.
10. Ibid, April 12, 1933, pp.2-4.
11. Wright communique, June 12, 1933.
12. CR 1933, pp.46-52.
13. Ibid, pp.65-66.
14. Ibid, pp.62-64.
15. Ibid, p.60.
16. Ibid, p.11.
17. Charlotte *News*, April 19, 1946.
18. IS, Oct. 1933, p.6.
19. Ibid, p.5; CR 1934, p.127.
20. Ibid, p.8.
21. Ibid, pp.41-44.
22. Ibid, pp. 64-65.
23. Ibid, pp.80-82.
24. Ibid, p.119.
25. Ibid, pp.133-135.
26. J. Wright ms.
27. CR 1934, pp.137-138.
28. Ibid, p.140.
29. Ibid, 1935, p.127.
30. J. Wright ms.
31. CR 1934, p.137.
32. University of Illinois release, May 21, 1955; CPD, Oct. 1936, p.16.
33. J. Wright ms.
34. IS, Feb. 1935 supplement, pp.4-5.
35. IS, April 1935, p.6.
36. Ibid, Feb. 1935, p.5.
37. Ibid, April 1935, pp.3-4.
38. CR 1935, pp.8-10.
39. Ibid, pp.13-14.
40. Ibid, p.17.
41. Ibid, p.25.
42. Ibid, pp.19-21.
43. Ibid, pp.29-45.
44. Ibid, pp.97,98.
45. Ibid, p.128.
46. Ibid, p.24.
47. Ibid, pp.123-127.
48. Bernie Conway to author, Dec. 22, 1967.
49. Pellegrin ms.
50. Ibid
51. PPCR 1936, p.35.
52. Ibid, p.23; Pellegrin ms.
53. Ibid; PPCR 1936, p.15.
54. IS, Sept.-Oct. 1936, p.5.
55. Ibid, Nov. 1935, p.5.
56. Ibid, undated supplement 1935.
57. Ibid, June 1936 (No.12), pp.2-5; July 1936, pp.8-10; PPCR 1936, p.36.
58. Ibid, pp.165, 170.
59. IS, June 10, 1936, pp.1-2.
60. PPCR 1936, pp.162-165.
61. Ibid, pp.18,25.
62. Ibid, pp.27-33.
63. Ibid, pp.87-104.
64. Ibid, pp.113-132.

65. Ibid, pp.133-142.
66. Ibid, pp.143-160.
67. Ibid, p.78.
68. Ibid, p.81.
69. Ibid, pp.83-86.
70. Ibid, pp.167-169.
71. CPD, Oct. 1936, p.13.
72. PPCR 1936, p.13.

4. Forward on All Fronts

1. F. Wright file
2. *Florida Teachers Magazine*, Dec. 1941, p.48.
3. IS, July 1936, p.5.
4. CPD, Sept. 1936, p.2.
5. Ibid, pp.2,11.
6. Ibid, Dec. 1936, p.3.
7. Ibid, pp.4-8,10.
8. Ibid, Jan. 1937, pp.4-9,16.
9. Ibid, Feb.-March 1937, pp.4-6.
10. Ibid, pp.9,16.
11. Ibid, April 1937, pp.4-8,15.
12. Ibid, May 1937, pp.6-13.
13. Ibid, Nov. 1936, p.16.
14. Ibid, Dec. 1936, p.14.
15. PPCR 1937, pp.156-163.
16. AR 1967, pp.55-56.
17. CPD, Jan. 1938, pp.14-22.
18. PPCR 1937, p.54.
19. Ibid, pp.115-129.
20. Ibid, pp.136-137.
21. Ibid, pp.154,139.
22. Ibid, p.43.
23. Ibid, p.5.
24. Ibid, pp.149-152.
25. Ibid, p.22.
26. DeCamp to author, Sept. 13, 1966.
27. Robert W. Bishop, "Reminiscences," DeCamp file.
28. PPCR 1938, p.22; CPD, Sept. 1937, p.28; Oct. 1937, p.14.
29. Ibid, Sept. 1937, pp.7-9.
30. Ibid, Oct. 1937, pp.4-7,10,16.
31. Ibid, April 1938, pp.7-9,15.
32. Ibid, pp.11-13.
33. Ibid, Nov. 1937, pp.4-9.
34. Ibid, April 1938, p.14; PPCR 1938, p.29.
35. PPCR 1938, p.29.
36. CPD, Sept. 1938, p.9.
37. PPCR 1938, pp.36-37.
38. Ibid, pp.15-16.
39. Ibid, p.83.
40. Ibid, p.84.
41. Ibid, pp.23-24.
42. Ibid, pp.5,96.
43. Ibid, pp.92,99.
44. Ibid, pp.95,96.
45. Graham ms; PPCR 1939, p.109.
46. PPCR 1938, pp.97-99.
47. DeCamp file.
48. CPD, Sept. 1938, pp.22-23.
49. Graham file.
50. CPD, Sept. 1938, p.2.
51. PPCR 1939, p.118.
52. CPD, Sept. 1938, p.17.
53. Ibid, Jan. 1939, p.7.
54. Ibid, Sept. 1938, p.17.
55. Ibid, March 1939, p.9.
56. Ibid, April 1939, p.9.
57. Ibid, Nov. 1938, p.4.
58. Ibid, April 1939, pp.11,18.
59. Ibid, May-June 1939, pp.3-4.
60. Ibid, Feb. 1939, p.10.
61. PPCR 1939, p.77.
62. Ibid, p.82.
63. Ibid, pp.18-27.
64. Ibid, pp.15-17.
65. Ibid, p.108.
66. Ibid, pp.108-113.
67. Ibid, p.114.
68. Ibid, pp.119-120.
69. Ibid, pp.121-122.
70. Ibid, p.123.
71. Ibid.
72. Ibid, pp.124-126.
73. Ibid, p.128.
74. Ibid, pp.129-130.
75. Eleanor Collier to Howard S. Curtis, May 4, 1959.
76. PPCR 1939, p.2.
77. Collier to Howard S. Curtis, May 4, 1959.
78. CPD, Sept. 1939, p.23
79. E. Ray Speare, *Interesting Happenings in Boston University's History*, p.107.
80. Boston *Globe*, May 8, 1955.
81. AR 1955, p.85.
82. Boston University release, July 19, 1955.
83. PPCR 1942, p.95.
84. Letters and publications, Collier file.
85. New England District's *Orbital Directions*, Fall-Winter 1968, p.12.
86. Collier to T. W. Van Arsdale, April 24, 1960.
87. Collier to Howard S. Curtis, May 4, 1959.
88. Springfield *Republican*, April 21, 1940; Mrs. John J. Mahoney to author, Dec. 18, 1967.
89. New England District's *Orbital Directions*, Fall-Winter 1968, p.13.
90. Springfield *Republican*, April 21, 1940.
91. CPD, Sept. 1939, p.8.
92. Springfield *Republican*, April 21, 1940.
93. CPD, Nov. 1939, p.6.
94. Ibid, Sept. 1936, p.3.
95. Ibid, pp.5-6.
96. Ibid, Dec. 1939, pp.3-4.
97. Ibid, Nov. 1939, p.5.
98. Ibid, May-June 1940, pp.4,6.
99. Ibid, p.13.
100. Ibid, Dec. 1939, p.6.
101. Ibid Feb. 1940, p.27.
102. Ibid, Nov. 1939, p.6.
103. Ibid, March 1940, pp.15-16.
104. Ibid, Feb. 1940, p.17.
105. Ibid, April 1940, p.30.
106. Ibid, May-June 1940, p.8.
107. PPCR 1940, p.132.

108. CPD, April 1940, pp.3-12.
109. PPCR 1940, pp.152-162.
110. Ibid, pp.167-170.
111. Ibid, pp.10,12.

5. War Clouds Over the Land

1. CPD, Sept. 1940, pp.11,23.
2. Ibid, Sept. 1940.
3. Ibid, pp.3-6.
4. Ibid, pp.9-10.
5. Ibid. Oct. 1940, pp.12-13.
6. Ibid, Jan 1941, p.6.
7. Ibid, Dec. 1940, p.6.
8. Ibid, Jan. 1941, pp.5,10.
9. Ibid, May-June, 1941, pp.3-4.
10. Ibid, Feb. 1941, p.3-5,16.
11. PPCR 1941, p.80.
12. Ibid, pp.57-60.
13. CPD, March 1941, p.23.
14. PPCR 1941, pp.77,86.
15. Ibid, pp.56-57.
16. CPD, Sept. 1940, pp.17-18; Dec. 1940, p.17; Feb. 1941, p.15; April 1941, pp.13-14,21-22; May-June 1941, pp.11-18,23; undated letter, Association President to ACPA members.
17. CPD, Sept. 1941, p.11.
18. PPCR 1941, p.6.
19. Ibid, p.11.
20. Ibid, pp.12-13.
21. Ibid, pp.23-24.
22. Ibid, p.25.
23. Ibid, pp.55-56.
24. Ibid, p.71.
25. Ibid, p.29.
26. Ibid, pp.65-72,105.
27. Ibid, pp.101-104.
28. Ibid, p.75.
29. Ibid, pp.52-53.
30. Ibid, p.92.
31. Ibid, p.74.
32. Ibid, pp.97-99.
33. CPD, Nov. 1941, p.23.
34. Ibid, Dec. 1941-Jan. 1942, p.23.
35. PPCR 1942, p.90.
36. CPD, Dec. 1941-Jan. 1942, p.23.
37. Ibid, Oct. 1941, p.19.
38. Ibid, Nov. 1941, p.2.
39. Ibid, Oct. 1941, pp.11-12.
40. Ibid, Dec. 1941-Jan. 1942, p.11.
41. Ibid, Feb. 1942, pp.11-12,18.
42. PPCR 1942, pp.89-90.
43. CPD, Dec. 1941-Jan. 1942, pp.7-8.
44. Ibid, Feb. 1942, pp.7-8.
45. Ibid, p.23.
46. Ibid, March 1942, pp.17-21.
47. Ibid, Dec. 1941-Jan. 1942, pp.3,12.
48. Ibid, July 1942, pp.3-4.
49. Ibid, Nov. 1941, pp.7-8.
50. Ibid, pp.9-10.
51. Ibid, Feb. 1942, pp.3-5.
52. Ibid, April 1942, pp.9-11.
53. Ibid, p.4.
54. Ibid, Dec. 1941-Jan. 1942, p.6.
55. Ibid, p.13; March 1942, pp.13-14.
56. Ibid, April 1942, p.18.
57. PPCR 1942, pp.5-9.
58. Ibid, pp.30-33.
59. Ibid, p.39.
60. Ibid, pp.61-62.
61. Ibid, p.52.
62. Ibid, pp.93-94.
63. Ibid, pp.89-104.
64. Ibid, pp.14,16.
65. Ibid, pp.97,17.
66. Ibid, p.18.
67. Ibid, pp.10-13.
68. Paul O. Ridings to author, May 4, 1973.
69. *The TCU Skiff,* March 12, 1948.
70. Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, March 12, 1948.
71. Fort Worth *Press,* March 9, 1948.
72. Fort Worth *Star-Telegram,* March 10, 1948.
73. Ellis ms.
74. *California Monthly,* Dec. 1956, pp11,12.
75. Ellis ms.
76. PP, Sept. 1942, p.23.
77. Ibid, Dec. 1942, p.2.
78. Ellis ms.
79. PP, Sept. 1942, p.18.
80. Ibid, April 1943, p.7.
81. Ellis ms; PDCR 1943, pp.93,95.
82. PP, Dec. 1942, p.18; Ellis ms.
83. PP, Jan. 1943, p.16.
84. Ibid, March 1943, p.3.
85. Ibid, April 1942, pp.20,3.
86. Ibid, p.18.
87. Ibid, Nov. 1942, pp.3-4,16.
88. Ibid, June 1943, pp.14-17.
89. Ibid, May 1943, p.3.
90. Ibid, Feb. 1943, pp.3-4,15-17.
91. Ibid, April 1943, p.14.
92. PDCR 1943, pp.22,24.
93. Ibid, pp.50-51.
94. Ibid, p.54.
95. Ibid, pp.54-58.
96. Ibid, pp.34-36.
97. Ibid, pp.81-83; PP, June 1943, pp.4-6.
98. PDCR 1943, pp.88-90.
99. Ibid, p.98.
100. PP, June 1943, pp.3-4.
101. Collier to Curtis, May 4, 1959.
102. Ellis to W. Henry Johnston, letter and attachment, March 3, 1952.
103. PDCR 1943, P.99.
104. Whittlesey ms.
105. *School and Society,* Nov. 13, 1943.
106. CPD, Nov. 1939, p.23.
107. PP, Sept. 1943, pp.5-6.
108. Ibid, p.17.
109. Ibid, Jan. 1944, p.14.
110. Ibid, Nov. 1943, pp.7,16.
111. Ibid, Feb. 1944, pp.12-14,16.
112. Ibid, March 1944, pp.4,13; June 1944, p.4.
113. Ibid, March 1944, p.16.

114. PDCR 1944, pp.141-153.
115. PP, May 1944, pp.12-13.
116. *Postwar Education in American Colleges and Universities*, p.v.
117. PDCR 1944, p.132.
118. *Postwar Education in American Colleges and Universities*, pp.2,7.
119. Ibid, p.11.
120. Ibid, p.17.
121. Ibid, pp.27,29.
122. Ibid, pp.33,36.
123. Ibid, p.39.
124. Ibid, pp.52,54.
125. Ibid, pp.55-58.
126. Ibid, p.60.
127. Ibid, p.62.
128. Ibid, p.64.
129. Ibid, p.72.
130. Ibid, pp.74-75.
131. Ibid, pp.vi,xi.
132. PDCR 1944, pp.86-94.
133. Ibid, pp.20-23.
134. Ibid, p.34,37.
135. Ibid, p.61.
136. Ibid, pp.65-69.
137. PP, Nov. 1944, p.17.
138. PDCR 1944, pp.113-114.
139. Ibid, pp.115,118.
140. Ibid, pp.117-126.
141. Ibid, pp.137-140.
142. Ibid, pp.11,122.
143. PP, Nov. 1944, p.13; Oct. 1944, p.11.
144. Quoted by Jack Howard, *The Daily Texan*, Oct. 3, 1939.
145. Brandon file; *Who's Who in America*, 38th Edition, Vol. I, p.352.
146. New York University release, Oct. 20, 1963.
147. Austin *American Statesman*, Oct. 8, 1939.
148. Spencer to author, Dec. 21, 1967.
149. Wyllie to author, Dec. 13, 1967.
150. PP, Oct. 1944, pp.3,14.
151. Ibid, p.13.
152. Brandon to EC, Nov. 27, 1944, pp.3-5.
153. AP, Jan. 20, 1945.
154. PP, June 1945, p.20.
155. Ibid, Oct. 1944, p.5.
156. FCC to author, July 28, 1975.
157. PP, Oct. 1944, p.22.
158. Ibid, Nov. 1944, pp.5-6.
159. Ibid, Jan. 1945, pp.3-4,22.
160. Ibid, Jan. 1945, pp.7-8,20.
161. Ibid, Dec. 1944, pp.5-6.
162. AP, Jan. 6, 1945.
163. AP, Jan. 17 and 24, 1945.
164. New Orleans *Item*, July 2, 1945.
165. PP, Feb. 1945, p.6.
166. Ibid, April 1945, p.14.
167. Brandon to EC, July 12, 1945.
168. PP, June 1945, p.6.
169. Ibid, Oct. 1945, pp.3,17-20.
170. Ibid, Nov. 1945, pp.3-4.
171. Ibid, Dec. 1945, pp.3,4,16.
172. Ibid, Feb. 1946, p.5.
173. CPRA 1947, pp.140-142.
174. PP, Feb. 1946, p.4.
175. Ibid, p.19.
176. Ibid, March 1946, pp.3-4; CPRA 1946, p.114.
177. Ibid, pp.29,31.
178. Ibid, p.60.
179. Ibid, pp.62-66.
180. Ibid, pp.66-67.
181. Ibid, pp.71-74,76
182. Ibid, pp.123,146,149-153.
183. Ibid, pp.127-140,143.
184. Ibid, pp.95-97.
185. Ibid, p.147.
186. Ibid, p.145.
187. Ibid, pp.115,117.

6. Evolution of a National Office

1. Schellenger to Roy K. Wilson, April 14, 1947, and to author Dec. 25, 1966.
2. Ibid.
3. Schellenger to Howard R. Curtis, March 10, 1959.
4. CPR, Jan. 1947, p.3.
5. Ibid, Nov. 1946, p.3.
6. Ibid, Jan. 1947, pp.3-4.
7. Ibid, Dec. 1946, pp.3-4,20-22.
8. Ibid, pp.5,7.
9. Ibid, Nov. 1946, pp.5,8.
10. Ibid, p.21.
11. Ibid, Jan. 1947, p.4.
12. Ibid, April 1947, p.13.
13. CPRA 1947, pp.107-108.
14. CPR, March 1947, p.16.
15. Ibid, Feb. 1947, pp.8-9.
16. CPRA 1947, pp.32-34.
17. Ibid, pp.15-19.
18. Ibid, p.52.
19. Ibid, pp.38,39,40.
20. CPR, March 1947, p.3.
21. CPRA 1947, pp.46,48.
22. Ibid, pp.102,140.
23. Ibid, pp.105,108; Ibid 1946, p.117.
24. Ibid, 1947, p.107.
25. Ibid, p.119.
26. Ibid, p.120.
27. Ibid, pp.13-14.
28. Ibid, p.120.
29. Ibid, p.111.
30. CPR, June 1947, p.3.
31. J. A. R. Pimlott, *Public Relations and American Democracy*, Princeton University Press, 1951, p.16.
32. Enclosure C, Ault to author, Dec. 29, 1967.
33. Renegar to author, Jan. 13, 1973.
34. Renegar ms.
35. CPR, Oct. 1947, p.3.
36. Ibid, April 1948, p.3.
37. Ibid, p.11.
38. Ibid, March 1948, p.19.
39. Ibid, Nov. 1947, p.17.

40. CPRA 1948, p.65; Renegar ms.
41. CPRA 1948, pp.65-69, 89-114.
42. Ibid, p.77.
43. *College Publicity Manual*, pp.v-viii.
44. CoSIDA file
45. CPR, Dec. 1947, p.10.
46. CPRA 1948, pp.21,24.
47. Ibid, p.30,31
48. Ibid, pp.33-37.
49. Ibid, pp.68,73.
50. Ibid, pp.63,79.
51. Ibid, pp.80-85.
52. Ibid, p.129.
53. Ibid, pp.13-14.
54. Ibid, pp.11,64.
55. Ibid, pp.45,46.
56. Carl Hughes, Pittsburgh *Press*, Dec. 4, 1945.
57. R. J. Hopkins, Pittsburgh *Sun-Telegraph* undated, Hannun file.
58. CPRQ, Oct. 1949, pp. 4,44.
59. CPR, Oct. 1948, p.22.
60. DeCamp report, April 25, 1949.
61. Hannum ms.
62. Ibid; CPRQ, Oct. 1949, p.46.
63. CPR, Nov. 1948, p.8.
64. Hannum ms.
65. CPR, Oct. 1948, p.2.
66. Ibid, Nov. 1948, p.6.
67. Ibid, Oct. 1948, p.2; CPRQ, 1949, p.40.
68. Ibid, Jan. 1949, p.9.
69. CPRQ, Oct. 1949, pp.24-26, 32-35.
70. CPR, Feb. 1949, p.22.
71. Ibid, Oct. 1948, p.6.
72. Ibid, April 1949, p.5.
73. Ibid, Nov. 1948, p.5.
74. CPRQ, Oct. 1949, p.49.
75. CPR, May-June 1949, p.9.
76. Ibid, Oct. 1948, p.10.
77. Ibid, May-June 1949, p.12.
78. CPRQ, Oct. 1949, p.7.
79. Ibid, pp.11,12.
80. Ibid, p.21.
81. Ibid, p.16.
82. Ibid, p.41-42.
83. Ibid, pp.45-46.
84. Ibid, pp.39,49.
85. Ibid, p.6.
86. Ibid, pp.36-38.
87. Ibid, pp.9-10.
88. Al Spiers, "Bartley 'Covered' Presidents," Bloomington, (Indiana), *Herald-Telephone*, Aug. 13, 1959.
89. Ibid, March 7, 1962.
90. Ibid, April 4, 1969.
91. Al Spiers, "Bartley 'Covered' Presidents"; Bloomington *Herald-Telephone*, April 4, 1969.
92. Bartley to Bradford Ansley, June 28, 1949.
93. Central Office Committee Report, June 28, 1950.
94. Ibid, Bartley ms.
95. Central Office Committee Report, June 28, 1950.
96. CPRQ, Oct. 1950, p.66.
97. Collier to Curtis, May 4, 1959.
98. NL, Aug. 5, 1950, p.1.
99. Ibid, Oct. 20, 1949, p.1.
100. CPRQ, Oct. 1949, p.2.
101. Ibid, July 1950, pp.14-17.
102. NL, Feb. 20, 1950, p.1; March 5, 1950, p.1.
103. Ibid, Jan. 20, 1950, p.1.
104. Ibid, Oct. 30, 1950, p.1.
105. CPRQ, April 1950, pp.6,9.
106. Ibid, pp.24-25,28.
107. Ibid, pp.35-40.
108. Ibid, Oct. 1950, pp.22-65; NL, May 15, 1950, p.1.
109. NL, Jan. 20, 1950, p.2.
110. CPRQ, Oct. 1950, p.3.
111. Bartley ms.
112. CPRQ, Oct. 1950, pp.4-6.
113. Ibid, pp.66-80.
114. Ibid, p.68
115. Ibid, p.70.
116. Ibid, p.66.
117. Bartley ms.
118. CPRQ, Oct. 1950, pp.20-21.
119. CPRQ, Oct. 1951, p.39.
120. Ibid, Jan. 1951, p.10.
121. Ibid, p.12.
122. Ibid, pp.11-14.
123. NL, Oct. 30, 1950.
124. CPRQ, Oct. 1951, p.46.
125. Ibid, pp.39-43.
126. NL, May 31, 1951.
127. Ibid, June 21, 1951.
128. Ibid, May 31, 1951.
129. Ibid, March 31, 1951.
130. CPRQ, Oct. 1951, p.34.
131. Ibid, pp.11-13.
132. Ibid, Jan. 1951, p.28.
133. Ibid, April 1951, p.5.
134. Ibid, July 1951, pp.13,16.
135. NL, Jan. 18, 1951.
136. CPRQ, Oct. 1951, pp.4-5.
137. Ibid, p.40; AR 1952, p.61.
138. CPRQ, Oct. 1951, pp.38-39.
139. Ibid, pp.46-47.
140. Ibid, pp.43-45.
141. Ibid, p.33.
142. Harral file.
143. CPRQ, Oct. 1951, pp.16-17.
144. Whittlesey file.

7. The Association Faces New Problems

1. AR 1952, p.51.
2. CPRQ, April 1952, p.12.
3. Ibid, pp.14-15.
4. Ibid, July 1952, pp.3-4.
5. Ibid, pp.5,10.
6. Ibid, pp.11-12,15.
7. Ibid, pp.16,22.
8. Ibid, Oct. 1952, pp.32-34; Schellenger to author, July 9, 1975.

9. NL, April 15, 1952.
10. Ibid, Sept. 30, 1951.
11. Ibid, Dec. 15, 1951.
12. Ibid, Dec. 1, 1951.
13. Ibid, April 1, 1952.
14. Ibid, April 15, 1952.
15. Ibid, Sept. 30, 1951.
16. Ibid, April 15, 1952.
17. Ibid, Jan. 15, 1952.
18. CPRQ, April 1952, p.33.
19. Ibid, pp.33-35.
20. Ibid, July 1952, pp.41-44.
21. Ibid, Oct. 1952, pp.6-8.
22. Ibid, pp.13-14.
23. Ibid, pp.20-21.
24. AR 1952, pp.55,19.
25. Ibid, p.57.
26. Ibid, pp.71,78.
27. Ibid, pp.72,93.
28. Ibid, p.69.
29. ACPRA roster; CPRQ, Oct. 1949.
30. ACPRA roster; AR 1952, pp.27-47.
31. AR 1952, pp.79-81.
32. Ibid, p.95.
33. NL, Feb. 1, 1952.
34. AR 1952, p.78.
35. CPRQ, Oct. 1952, pp.17-19.
36. CPRQ, Jan. 1953, p.9.
37. Ibid, April 1953, pp.3-5,8-9.
38. Ibid, Oct. 1953, pp.6-8.
39. Ibid, April 1953, p.4.
40. Ibid, July 1953, p.38.
41. Ibid, Oct. 1953, pp.21,25-37.
42. NL, Oct. 15, 1952.
43. Ibid, March 15, 1953.
44. AR 1952, p.5.
45. CPRQ, Oct. 1953, pp.50-52.
46. NL, Feb. 1, 1953; AR 1953, p.54.
47. CPRQ, Oct. 1953, pp.44-49; AR 1953, p.56.
48. Ibid, pp.46-47.
49. NL, Dec. 15, 1952; Feb. 15, 1953.
50. CPRQ, Oct. 1953, pp.9-13.
51. AR 1953, pp.50,73.
52. Ibid, pp.48-49.
53. Ibid, p.45; John Moser to author, Dec. 22, 1967, VonderHaar file.
54. AR 1953, pp.50,53,72.
55. Ibid, pp.58,45.
56. Ibid, pp.60,61.
57. Ibid, p.63.
58. Ibid, pp.69,74.
59. Ibid, p.67.
60. Ibid, p.82.
61. Ibid, p.71.
62. CPRQ, Oct. 1953, p.15.
63. NL, Nov. 1, 1953.
64. AR 1954, pp.86-87.
65. Ibid, p.79.
66. Ibid, pp.94-95.
67. Ibid, pp.95-98.
68. NL, June 1, 1954.
69. AR 1954, p.10.
70. Ibid, p.48.
71. Ibid, pp.62,57.
72. CPRQ, Jan. 1954, p.5.
73. Ibid, April 1, 1954, p.17.
74. Ibid, Jan. 1954, pp.22-23.
75. Ibid, July 1954, p.9.
76. Ibid, p.10.
77. NL, Nov. 15, 1953.
78. Ibid, April 15, 1954.
79. Ibid, Oct. 15, 1953.
80. Ibid, Dec. 1, 1953.
81. CPRQ, Jan. 1954, p.39.
82. NL, Dec. 1, 1953.
83. Ibid.
84. CPRQ, July 1954, pp.41-48.
85. AR 1954, pp.21-45.
86. CPRQ, Oct. 1954, pp.3-12; AR, 1954, p.74.
87. Ibid, pp.58-59.
88. Ibid, pp.54-55.
89. Ibid, pp.64,80.
90. Ibid, pp.68-69,81.
91. Ibid, p.48.
92. CPRQ, Oct. 1954, pp.58-59.
93. AR 1954, p.76.
94. Ibid, p.48.
95. CPRQ, Oct. 1954, p.23
96. NL, Aug. 15, 1954.
97. Ibid, Nov. 1, 1954.
98. AR 1955, pp.12,62.
99. Ibid, pp.56,61-62.
100. Ibid, pp.73-74,81-82.
101. Ibid, pp.54-55.
102. Ibid, pp.58,80-82.
103. Ibid, pp.60,80.
104. Ibid, p.79.
105. Ibid, p.66.
106. Ibid, p.53.
107. Ibid, pp.68,59.
108. NL, Sept. 1, 1954.
109. *Harper's*, Jan. 1955, pp.18-19.
110. NL, Feb. 1, 1955.
111. AR 1955, p.64.
112. Ibid, p.71.
113. CPRQ, Jan. 1955, pp.5-15.
114. Ibid, pp.33-34.
115. Ibid, Oct. 1955, p.4ff.
116. AR 1955, pp.75-77.
117. Ibid, p.78.
118. Ibid, p.85.
119. CPRQ, Oct. 1955, p.60.
120. Ibid, pp.10-11.
121 Ibid, pp.6-8.
122. Ibid, p.3.
123. *Emory Alumnus*, Feb. 1960.
124. NL, Nov. 11, 1955.
125. Quill, Jan. 1956, pp.5,14.
126. Ansley file.
127. Ansley to Curtis, March 30, 1959.
128. NL, Oct. 20, 1955.
129. CPRQ, April 1956, pp.13-14.
130. Ibid, July 1956, pp.21-22.
131. Proceedings, ACPRA Development Officers Workshop, March 16, 1956.
132. AR 1956, pp.73-75.
133. Ansley to Curtis, March 30, 1959.
134. AR 1956, p.76.

135. Memorandum to President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, July 7, 1956.
136. AR 1956, p.59.
137. NL, Jan. 30, 1956.
138. Ibid, Jan. 15, 1956.
139. CPRQ, Jan. 1956, pp.8-9.
140. AR 1956, p.64.
141. NL, Jan. 30, 1956.
142. AR 1956, p.65.
143. CPRQ, July 1956, pp.15-18.
144. CPRQ, April 1956, p.11.
145. NL, post-convention issue, 1956.
146. Convention Reports 1956, p.2.
147. Ibid, p.3.
148. AR 1956, pp.61,62
149. Ibid, pp.71-72.
150. Ibid, pp.78,74.
151. Ibid, p.64; NL, post convention issue.
152. AR 1956, pp.82,83.
153. Ibid, pp.58,60.
154. Convention Reports 1956, p.1.

8. Appraising the Association

1. AR 1957, p.72.
2. Ibid, pp.65-66.
3. Baltimore *Sun*, Nov. 30, 1966.
4. *Who's Who in America*, vol. 35, p.1744.
5. SC Progress Report, June 24, 1957, p.3.
6. AR 1957, p.70.
7. NL, Oct.-Nov. 1956.
8. AR 1957, p.64.
9. Ibid, pp.68,73.
10. Ibid, p.67.
11. Ibid, p.75.
12. Ibid, p.73; NL, Oct.-Nov. 1956.
13. *Pride*, Feb. 1957, p.8.
14. Ibid, p.9.
15. Ibid, April 1957, p.5.
16. EC, Enclosure F, Oct. 9-10, 1956; *Pride*, Jan. 1957, p.7.
17. AR 1957, p.65.
18. NL, Oct.-Nov. 1956; AR 1957, p.64,71.
19. Ibid, 1956, p.64; Ibid, 1957, p.73.
20. Ibid, pp.76,83-84.
21. *Pride*, Jan. 1957, p.7.
22. AR 1957, p.71.
23. *Pride*, Jan. 1957, pp.12-13.
24. Ibid, March 1957, p.8.
25. AR 1957, p.68.
26. Ibid, p.66.
27. CoSIDA, "Chronological History," p.2.
28. AR 1957, p.67.
29. CoSIDA, "Chronological History," p.3.
30. AR 1958, p.84.
31. Ibid, 1957, p.63.
32. Ibid, pp.69-72.
33. Ibid, pp.74-77.
34. Ibid, p.86.
35. Ibid, pp.62,3.
36. Ibid, pp.71,75,11.
37. Ibid, p.76.
38. Poole to author, Jan. 9, 1966.
39. SC, Progress Report, June 24, 1957.
40. *Pride*, Sept. 1957, p.8.
41. SC, Progress Report, June 24, 1957, pp.6-14.
42. *Pride*, Sept. 1957, p.8.
43. Ibid, April 1958, p.6.
44. AR 1958, pp.74-76.
45. Ibid, p.84.
46. *Pride*, Oct. 1957, p.11.
47. Ibid, March 1958, p.5.
48. Ibid, May 1958, p.5.
49. Ibid, March 1958, pp.10-11.
50. Ibid, June 1958, pp.8-10.
51. Ibid, Feb. 1958, p.4; AR 1958, p.69.
52. *Pride*, June 1958, pp.14-15.
53. Ibid, March 1958, p.8; May 1958, pp.20-22.
54. Ibid, June 1958, pp.11-13,16-17.
55. AR 1958, pp.66,70.
56. Ibid, p.61.
57. Ibid, pp.69,80.
58. Ibid, pp.69-70.
59. Ibid, pp.69.78.
60. Ibid, pp.64,78.
61. Ibid, p.84.
62. Ibid, pp.78,80.
63. Ibid, p.85.
64. Ibid, pp.83,85.
65. Ibid, pp.82,91.
66. Ibid, pp.65-84.
67. Ibid, p.100.
68. Ibid, pp.85-87.
69. Ibid, p.62.
70. Gordon Strayer to author, Dec. 8, 1973.
71. *Pride*, April 1958, pp.13-17.
72. Presidential address ms., "Educational PR and the Professional Attitude," Jordan file.
73. AR 1958, p.63.
74. AR 1959, p.69.
75. AUSHE, Foreword.
76. Ibid, pp.7-12.
77. Ibid, pp.23-25.
78. Ibid, pp.31-36.
79. Ibid, pp.39-42.
80. Ibid, pp.45-55.
81. Ibid, pp.58-59.
82. Ibid, pp.63-67.
83. CPRA 1946, p.128.
84. AR 1959, p.74.
85. Curtis address to districts, ms. copy.
86. AR 1959, p.66.
87. Ibid, pp.76-77.
88. *Pride*, Oct. 1958, p.4.
89. AR 1959, p.71.
90. Ibid, p.69.
91. Ibid, p.77.
92. Ibid, p.70.
93. AR 1959, p.72.
94. Ibid, pp.73-74.
95. *Pride*, June 1959, p.3.
96. AR 1959, pp.67-68.

97. *Pride,* Jan. 1959, p.9.
98. Ibid, Feb. 1959, pp.5-6.
99. Ibid, March 1959, p.8.
100. Ibid, May 1959, pp.8-9.
101. Ibid, June 1959, p.6.
102. Ibid, May 1959, p.3.
103. AR 1959, pp.64,86,83.
104. Ibid, pp.78-80.
105. Ibid, p.76.
106. Ibid.
107. Ibid, p.65.
108. Curtis address at French Lick, ms. copy.
109. *Pride,* Feb. 1960, p.5.
110. AR 1960, pp.67-68.
111. Ibid, 1959, p.77.
112. *Pride,* Sept. 1959, p.4.
113. Ibid, Feb. 1960, p.5.
114. SC Report, July 1960, introduction, pp.3-4.
115. Ibid, summary, p.3; conclusion, pp.1-5.
116. Ibid, recommendations, p.1.
117. Ibid, pp.2-7.
118. AR 1960, p.66.
119. *Pride,* Jan.-Feb. 1961, p.4.
120. AR 1960, pp.66-67.
121. AR 1960, pp.95-96; SC Report, July 1960, Articles of Organization, pp.1-3.
122. SC Report, July 1960, general policy statement, p.3.
123. *Pride,* Sept. 1960, p.4.
124. AR 1960, p.81; *Pride,* May 1960, p.4.
125. Ibid, Jan. 1960, p.3.
126. AR 1960, p.69; *Pride,* May 1960, p.4.
127. AR 1960, p.68.
128. *Pride,* June 1960, p.4.
129. AR 1960, p.72.
130. Ibid, p.73.
131. Ibid; *Pride,* April 1960, p.4.
132. AR 1960, p.80.
133. Ibid, p.79; *Pride,* May 1960, p.30.
134. AR 1960, pp.72,78.
135. Ibid, p.65.
136. Ibid, p.74.
137. Ibid, p.69.
138. *Pride,* Nov. 1959, p.4; March 1960, p.4; April 1960, p.4.
139. Ibid, Nov. 1959, p.4.
140. Ibid, Jan. 1960, pp.5-7.
141. Ibid, Feb. 1960, p.3.
142. AR 1960, pp.70-75.
143. Ibid, pp.81,104.
144. Ibid, p.91; EC, Sept. 27, 1960.
145. AR 1960, p.88.
146. Ibid, p.67.
147. *Pride,* April 1960, pp.9-11.

9. Expansion in the Early Sixties

1. Voice report; AR 1961-62, p.41.
2. Ibid, pp.42-44.
3. AR 1960, p.91.
4. Ibid, 1961-62, p.44.
5. Ibid, p.17.
6. Ibid, pp.25,26,28.
7. Ibid, p.19.
8. Ibid, p.87.
9. Ibid, p.24.
10. Ibid, pp.20-23.
11. Ibid, pp.47-48,51.
12. Ibid, pp.14-16.
13. Ibid, p.49.
14. Ibid, pp.49-50.
15. Ibid, pp.28-30.
16. Ibid, p.79.
17. Ibid, pp.31-32.
18. Ibid, p.81.
19. Ibid, p.29.
20. Ibid, p.13.
21. Ibid, pp.51-53.
22. Ibid, p.15; *Pride,* June 1961, p.4.
23. Ibid, May 1961, pp.7-8.
24. AR 1961-62, p.49.
25. NL, June 1962, p.3.
26. *Pride,* May 1961, pp.10-11.
27. AR 1961-62, pp.66-69.
28. *Pride,* Dec. 1960, p.4.
29. Ibid, March 1961, p.5.
30. Ibid, p.4.
31. Ibid, April 1961, p.3.
32. Ibid, Oct. 1960, pp.5-7.
33. Ibid, Nov. 1960, pp.5-11.
34. Ibid, April 1961, p.6.
35. Ibid, Jan.-Feb. 1961, p.4.
36. AR 1961-62, pp.60-61,90-91.
37. NL, Jan.-Feb. 1962, p.5.
38. Schaefer address, ms. copy.
39. AR 1961-62, pp.33-34.
40. Ibid, pp.38-39.
41. Ibid, p.61.
42. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.21.
43. NL, Sept. 1961; June 1962.
44. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.9.
45. Ibid, p.8; NL, Jan.-Feb. 1962, pp.12-13.
46. Schaefer Report, 1962 annual meeting, pp.20-21.
47. NL, Sept. 1961, p.5.
48. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.20.
49. NL, Nov.-Dec. 1961, pp.1-2.
50. Ibid, March 1962, p.1.
51. Ibid, June 1962, p.1.
52. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.20.
53. NL, Oct. 1962, p.4.
54. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell Report, Feb. 16, 1962.
55. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, pp.11,21.
56. AR 1961-62, p.37.
57. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, pp.10-14.
58. AR 1961-62, pp.55-56.
59. CUJ, Winter 1962, pp.4-7.
60. NL, Nov.-Dec. 1961, p.4; Jan.-Feb. 1962, p.1.
61. Ibid, Oct. 1962, pp.9,11,12.
62. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.12.
63. AR 1961-62, p.55; 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.20.
64. NL, Oct. 1962, p.7.

65. AR 1963, p.18.
66. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.21.
67. Ibid, pp.12,24.
68. Ibid, pp.20,21.
69. AR 1961-62, p.39.
70. Ibid, p.58.
71. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.15.
72. Nicholson Report, June 1962.
73. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.74.
74. Ibid, pp.12-13.
75. Ibid, p.6.
76. Bintzer to author, March 18, 1968.
77. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.17.
78. Bintzer address, ms. copy.
79. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.17.
80. AR 1963, pp.1-5.
81. Memo "To Fellow Members of ACPRA," May 1963.
82. AR 1963, pp.6,14,16.
83. NL, Oct. 1962, pp.2-4; Jan. 1963, p.6.
84. 1962 Annual Meeting Report, p.14; NL, Jan. 1963, p.7.
85. Ibid, pp.3,8,10; April 1963, p.1.
86. Ibid, Oct 1962, p.4.
87. AR 1963, p.2.
88. NL, April 1963, p.4.
89. Bylaws, Dec. 1960.
90. AR 1963, p.7.
91. NL, Jan. 1963, p.2.
92. AR 1963, p.10; ACPRA Programs and Membership, 1963, p.9.
93. AR 1963, p.10.
94. NL, Jan. 1963, p.7; Feb. 1963, p.15; April 1963, p.4.
95. AR 1963, pp.4,10.
96. NL, Oct. 1962, p.5.
97. Ibid, April 1963, pp.3,7.
98. AR 1963, pp.3,4; NL, Aug. 1963, pp.8-11.
99. AR 1963, pp.8,22.
100. Ibid, p.3.
101. Ibid, pp.8-9.
102. CUJ, Fall 1962, p.8.
103. Ibid, Spring 1963, pp.50-64.
104. Ibid, pp.45,47.
105. AR 1963, pp.2-6.
106. Ibid; NL, Aug. 1963, p.7.
107. AR 1963, p.5.
108. NL, Aug. 1963, pp.1-2.
109. AR 1963, pp.7,11.
110. NL, Jan. 1963, p.5; May 1963, pp.2-3,8-11.
111. Brandon address, June 24, 1963, ms. copy.
112. Nicholson to author, Feb. 1, 1968.
113. CUJ, Fall 1963, pp.11-13.
114. Ibid, p.32.
115. AR 1963, p.10.
116. Ibid, pp.18-19; NL, Jan. 1963, p.7.
117. AR 1963, p.11.
118. Bintzer address, ms. copy.
119. AR 1963, pp.15-16; NL, Aug. 1963, pp.1-2.
120. Hewlett file; *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 35, p.1015.
121. NL, Oct. 1963, pp.1-2.
122. AR 1964, pp.84,95,87.
123. AR 1965, p.80.
124. AR 1964, pp.93-94.
125. NL, April 1964, pp.4-5.
126. JLC, April 10, 1964; AR 1964, pp.87-94.
127. NL, April 1964, p.15.
128. AR 1964, pp.92-94.
129. NL, Oct. 1963, p.3.
130. AR 1964, p.86.
131. AR 1965, p.88.
132. AR 1964, pp.83,85,87,88.
133. Ibid, pp.81-83,88; NL, Jan. 1964, p.5.
134. AR 1964, pp.84-85.
135. Ibid, p.87.
136. NL, Aug. 1964, p.4.
137. AR 1964, pp.97-98.
138. NL, Oct. 1963, p.1; Jan. 1964, pp.1-3.
139. Ibid, Oct. 1964, pp.8,3.
140. EA, Oct. 1963, and Leslie's accompanying letter.
141. CUJ, Spring 1964, pp.44-48.
142. Ibid, pp.34-38.
143. Ibid, pp.14-22.
144. AR 1964, p.80.
145. Ibid, p.90.
146. Ibid, p.84,91; NL, April 1964, p.3.
147. AR 1964, pp.80,78.
148. Ibid, p.87; NL, Aug. 1964, p.14.
149. AR 1964, p.80; NL, June 1964, p.14.
150. Ibid, pp.6-7.
151. Ibid, April 1964, p.3.
152. Ibid, Aug. 1964, pp.6-7,10.
153. AR 1964, p.89.
154. Ibid, p.85.
155. Ibid, 1965, pp.87,80.
156. CUJ, Fall 1964, pp.3-6.
157. East Lansing, Mich., *State Journal*, Sept. 27, 1959.
158. Edward J. Zabrusky to author, July 17, 1974.
159. *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 35, p.580.
160. W. Lowell Treaster to author, Dec. 21, 1967.
161. Denison to Beatrice Field, Aug. 6, 1964.
162. Field to Denison, Aug. 20, 1964.
163. Denison to Field, Aug. 27, 1964.
164. Denison to Field, Oct. 6, 1964.
165. AAC/ACPRA Summary of Relationships, Nov. 13, 1964.
166. Leslie letter, Nov. 13, 1964.
167. Ibid; Leslie memo, Dec. 16, 1964.
168. Denison to BT, Jan. 11, 1965.
169. LC to ACPRA members, Jan. 11, 1965.
170. Denison file.
171. Hewlett to Stadtman, Feb. 12, 1965.
172. Stadtman to Hewlett, Feb. 10, 1965.
173. Field to Denison, Feb. 10, 1965.
174. Denison to Field, Feb. 16, 1965.
175. AAC/ACPRA Opinion Survey, Dec. 1964.
176. AAC Statement to Members, Feb. 5, 1965.
177. Denison to Fred Hess, Feb. 26, 1965.
178. LC, approved notes, Feb. 24, 1965; AR 1965, p.91.
179. Denison to Hess, Feb. 26, 1965.
180. AR 1965, p.92.
181. Denison to BT, Feb. 26, 1965.

182. AR 1964, p.95.
183. Denison to BT, Feb. 26, 1965.
184. AR 1965, pp.89-93.
185. AAC/ACPRA file, April 20, 1965.
186. NL, Feb. 1965, p.3.
187. Ibid, Oct. 1964, p.5; Feb. 1965, p.8.
188. AR 1965, pp.82,88.
189. NL, Feb. 1965, p.3; AR 1965, p.88.
190. NL, Feb. 1965, p.6; April 1965, p.4; June 1965, p.10.
191. AR 1965, pp.81,83-84.
192. MD 1964, p.35.
193. MD 1974, pp.47-48.
194. NL, Aug. 1964, p.16; Feb. 1965, p.10.
195. COTP, April 26, 1965.
196. CUJ, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.9-13.
197. NL, Sept. 1965, p.2.
198. AR 1964, pp.86-87; NL, Aug. 1964, p.14.
199. Ibid, April 1965, pp.1-3; June 1965, pp.4-5; Aug. 1965, p.7.
200. Ibid, Dec. 1964, p.1; June 1965, pp.2-3.
201. Ibid, April 1965, pp.6-7; June 1965, p.1.
202. Ibid, Aug. 1965, p.2.
203. Ibid, Feb. 1965, pp.7,10; June 1965. p.5.
204. Ibid, Aug. 1965, pp.8-11.
205. National Awards Policy Com., April 27, 1965.
206. AR 1965, pp.82,83,86; NL, Aug. 1965, p.2.
207. AR 1964, p.2; AR 1965, p.85.
208. Ibid, pp.76-78.
209. Ibid, 1966, p.86.
210. Ibid, 1965, pp.89-90.
211. NL, Aug. 1965, pp.1-3.

10. Celebration—and Acceleration

1. AR 1964, p.87.
2. Ibid, 1965, p.80.
3. *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 35, p.1614.
4. Nicholson file.
5. NL, Oct. 1965, p.3; Aug. 1966, p.3; AR 1966, pp.95-96.
6. Ibid, pp.87,91.
7. Ibid, pp.92-93.
8. Ibid, pp.87,84.
9. NL, Feb. 1966, p.3.
10. AR 1966, p.91; Ibid, 1967, p.55.
11. MD, 1964.
12. AR 1966, p.95.
13. AR 1965, pp.81,83,88; Ibid, 1966, pp.86,91; NL, Dec.-Jan. 1966, p.1; Feb. 1966, p.2; May 1966, p.5.
14. AR 1966, p.88.
15. NL, April 1966, p.3.
16. AR 1966, p.90.
17. Ibid, pp.94-95.
18. NL, March 1966, p.1.
19. Ibid, April 1966, p.2.
20. AR 1966, p.95.
21. NL, April 1966, p.3.
22. AR 1966, pp.88-90,92,94,97; NL, Aug. 1966, p.8.
23. AR 1966, pp.86,88,91; NL, Dec. 1966, p.3.
24. NL, March 1966, p.2; May 1966, p.5.
25. AR 1966, pp.4-5.
26. Ibid, pp.86,90-91.
27. Ibid, pp.89,96; NL, March 1966, p.1.
28. Ibid, Sept. 1965, p.5.
29. Nicholson file.
30. AR 1966, p.92; NL, Aug. 1966, p.12.
31. Ibid, p.8.
32. AR 1966, pp.88,91.
33. NL, Aug. 1966, p.1.
34. *News of ACPRA at Boston*, July 5, 1966.
35. CUJ, Fall 1966, pp.49-51.
36. NL, Aug. 1966, pp.4-7.
37. Ibid, p.1; *News of ACPRA at Boston*, July 8, 1966, pp.4-9.
38. Ibid; NL, Aug. 1966, p.8; Oct. 1966, p.4.
39. AR 1966, pp.87-88.
40. Ibid, p.93.
41. Ibid, pp.87,84.
42. Nicholson address, ms., July 6, 1966, Nicholson file.
43. BT, July 4, 1966.
44. Rowland file.
45. AR 1967, pp.55-56.
46. NL, Feb. 1967, p.3.
47. AR 1967, pp.91,95.
48. NL, Jan. 1967, p.1; June-July 1967, p.7.
49. AR 1967, p.89.
50. NL, Jan. 1967; Sept. 1967.
51. AR 1967, p.90.
52. NL, Sept. 1966, p.2; Dec. 1966, p.1; BT, April 14, 1967.
53. EC, July 5, 1966.
54. NL, Oct. 1966, p.2.
55. BT, April 14, 1967; NL, May 1967, pp.1-2.
56. CUJ, Spring 1967, pp.41-42.
57. Ibid, pp.10-15.
58. Ibid, Summer 1966, p.47.
59. Ibid, Summer 1967, pp.45-46.
60. Ibid, Fall 1966, pp.45-48.
61. Ibid, Summer 1967, p.17.
62. NL, Sept. 1966, p.1; AR 1967, p.82.
63. NL, Oct. 1966, p.2; AR 1967, p.87.
64. NL, Aug. 1967, p.7.
65. EC, Sept. 26-27, 1966; NL, Oct. 1966, p.2; April 1967, p.1.
66. Ibid, Oct. 1966, p.2.
67. AR 1967, p.88.
68. EC, Sept. 26-27, 1966.
69. BT, April 14, 1967.
70. EC, Sept. 26-27, 1966; NL, Nov. 1966, p.3.
71. Ibid, Aug. 1967, p.8.
72. BT, April 14, 1967.
73. EC, Sept. 26, 1966.
74. BT, April 14, 1967.
75. Ibid, July 4, 1966; NL, Nov. 1966, p.1.
76. EC, Sept. 26-27, 1966.
77. BT, April 14, 1967.
78. CUJ, Summer 1967, p.2.
79. NL, Aug. 1967.
80. PPCR 1942, p.13.
81. Denison to Fred Hess, Feb. 3, 1964.

82. NL, Aug. 1967, p.1.
83. Ibid, pp.4-6.
84. EC, Sept. 26-27, 1966.
85. NL, Feb. 1967.
86. Ibid, Aug. 1967.
87. AR 1967, pp.85-86.
88. Leslie report to member institutions, July 27, 1967.
89. NL, Sept. 1967.
90. Rowland address ms., July 27, 1967, Rowland file.
91. Gordon Strayer to author, Jan. 9, 1975.
92. NL, Sept. 1967.
93. Mrs. Massey to author, Feb. 13, 1975.
94. MD 1968, pp.116,117.
95. John Leslie to author, Sept. 24, 1974.
96. EC, July 13, 1968.
97. NL, Oct. 1967; March 14 and July 14, 1968.
98. RTM 1968, p.120.
99. NL, April 1968; BT, March 14, 1968.
100. RTM 1968, p.120.
101. JLC, May 23, 1968.
102. BT, Sept. 21, 1967; March 13, 1968; NL, Feb. 1968.
103. BT, Sept. 21, 1967; July 14, 1968; RTM 1968, pp.119,125.
104. COTP, Nov. 14, 1967; BT, July 14, 1968.
105. TECH, March/April 1968, pp.1-2.
106. RTM 1968, p.118.
107. CUJ, Fall 1968, back cover.
108. Ibid, Spring 1968, pp.11,13-14.
109. Ibid, Winter 1968, pp.20-21.
110. Ibid, Spring 1968, pp.3-4.
111. Ibid, pp.17-32.
112. Ibid, Summer 1968, pp.24-27.
113. Ibid, Spring 1968, pp..46-47.
114. Ibid, Summer 1968, pp.43-44.
115. NL, July/Aug. 1968, p.4.
116. Ibid, pp.9-12.
117. RTM 1968, p.119.
118. EC, Sept. 21-22, 1967.
119. Business meeting, July 7, 1968.
120. Massey file.
121. EC, July 24, 1967.
122. Parry Sorensen to author, Nov. 10, 1974.
123. EC, July 13, 1968.
124. NL, July 17, 1968.
125. RTM 1968, pp.120-121,125.
126. NL, Aug. 1969.
127. University of Michigan release, July 19, 1968, Radock file.
128. NL, March 1969.
129. BT, July 14, 1968; Feb. 26, 1969; EC, Sept. 26, 1968, NL, March 1969; RTM 1969, p.122.
130. NL, March 1969.
131. RTM 1969, p.122.
132. NL, Aug. 1969.
133. Ibid, March 1969.
134. BT, July 20, 1969; RTM 1968, p.120.
135. NL, Sept.-Oct. and Nov. 1968; RTM 1968, p.121.
136. NL, Nov. 1968; March, 1969.
137. Ibid, April 1969; RTM 1969, p.120.
138. BT, July 20, 1969.
139. Prescott report, May 8, 1969, AAC/ACPRA file.
140. NL, April 1969.
141. BT, Feb. 26-27, 1969.
142. NL, Special Tax Issue, Aug. 12, 1969.
143. RTM 1969, p.121.
144. NL, Aug. 1969.
145. NL, Jan. 1969.
146. CUJ, Fall 1969, pp.34-39.
147. Ibid, pp.45-48.
148. NL, June/July 1969, and Conference Program.
149. NL, Aug. 1969.
150. RTM 1969, p.122.
151. BT, July 20, 1969.
152. EC, Sept. 26, 1968.
153. BT, July 20, 1969.
154. RTM 1969, p.120.
155. Ibid, pp.123-124,127; FC, April 12, 1969.
156. BT, July 20, 1969.
157. Ibid; RTM 1969, p.120.
158. EC, July 24, 1969.
159. CUJ, Fall 1969, back cover.
160. Ibid, Fall 1968, pp.3-10.
161. Ibid, Winter 1969, pp.11-15.
162. Ibid, Summer 1969, pp.9-12.
163. Ibid, p.28.
164. Ibid, pp.41-43.
165. Ibid, Spring 1969, pp.44-47.
166. *Public Relations Journal*, Oct. 1968, p.20.
167. University of Michigan release, Nov. 17, 1968, and clippings, Radock file.
168. NL, Aug. 1970.
169. Ibid, Jan. and Aug. 1970; RTM 1970, p.76.
170. NL, Aug. 1970; RTM 1970, p.76.
171. CUJ, Summer 1970, pp.18-22.
172. Ibid, pp.28-29.
173. CUJ, Winter 1970, p.6.
174. NL, March 1970.
175. BT, April 9, 1970.
176. NL, Sept.-Oct. 1969; RTM 1970, p.77.
177. BT, Jan. 26, 1970.
178. BT, July 24, 1969; July 5, 1970.
179. EC, Oct. 14, 1969; April 9, 1970; BT, Jan. 26, 1970.
180. BT, Oct. 14, 1969.
181. NL, Aug. 1970.
182. EC, Oct. 14, 1970.
183. BT, July 14, 1969.
184. EC, April 9, 1970.
185. EC, Oct. 14, 1969.
186. BT, Jan. 26, 1970.
187. CUJ, Feb. 1970, pp. 5-15.
188. BT, Feb. 12-13, and July 5, 1970.
189. Ibid, Jan. 26 and July 5, 1970.
190. CUJ, Winter 1970, pp. 18, 19.
191. Ibid, Spring 1970, p. 19.
192. Ibid, Summer 1970, pp. 5-12.
193. NL, June/July, 1970; RTM 1970, p. 77.
194. CUJ, Fall 1970, pp. 37-39.
195. NL, Dec. 1969.
196. Ibid, June/July and Aug. 1970.

197. Ibid, May 1970.
198. Ibid, Aug. 1970.
199. RTM 1970, pp. 83, 80.
200. Business meeting, July 8, 1970.
201. Sorensen to author, Nov. 10, 1974.
202. NL, Aug. 1970.

11. On Course to a Greater Future

1. Dittman to Rennebohm, June 15, 1970.
2. Rennebohm to Dittman, July 17, 1970.
3. Dittman memo, April 7, 1971.
4. Rennebohm to Wells, June 10, 1971.
5. Dittman to Wells, June 18, 1971.
6. BT, July 18, 1971.
7. Ibid, July 22, 1971.
8. EC, Oct. 4, 1971.
9. NL, Aug. 1971, pp. 1,3
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. NL, Nov. 1970.
13. Ibid, Jan. 1971; AR 1971, p. 2.
14. FC, Dec. 7, 1970; BT, Dec. 8, 1970.
15. NL, June and Aug. 1971.
16. Ibid, March 1971.
17. AR 1971, p. 5.
18. NL, Dec. 1970.
19. Ibid, Sept.-Oct. 1970.
20. EC, April 12-13, 1971.
21. BT, Dec. 8-9, 1970.
22. Ibid, July 18, 1971.
23. Ibid, Dec. 8-9, 1970.
24. EC, April 12, 1971
25. NL, March 1971.
26. Ibid, Nov. 1970.
27. CUJ, Jan. 1971, pp. 4-14
28. Ibid, p. 7.
29. Ibid, pp. 10-11.
30. Ibid, p. 6.
31. Ibid, pp. 12-13.
32. Ibid, pp. 18-19.
33. Ibid, March 1971, pp. 9-12.
34. Ibid, May 1971, pp. 5-7.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid, pp. 10-12.
37. Ibid, pp. 14-16.
38. Ibid, p. 1.
39. NL, Sept. 1971.
40. TECH, April 1971, pp. 13-15.
41. NL, June 1971.
42. Ibid, Aug. 1971.
43. Ibid, Jan. and Aug. 1971.
44. CUJ, Sept. 1971, back cover; NL, Jan. 1972.
45. BT, July 1971; business meeting, July 20, 1971.
46. NL, Aug. 1971; BT, Dec. 8, 1970.
47. Ibid; EC, April 12-13, 1971.
48. AR, 1971, pp. 7-8, 10.
49. NL, Sept. 1971.
50. Dittman addresses, ms. copies.
51. Murphy to author, Nov. 14, 1974.
52. BT, July 22, 1971.
53. Ibid, Dec. 2-3, 1971.
54. NEWS, Jan. 1972.
55. BT, July 17, 1972.
56. NEWS, March 1972.
57. BT, Dec. 2-3, 1971.
58. Ibid, July 22 and Dec. 2-3, 1971; EC, Oct. 4-5, 1971.
59. BT, July 22, 1971.
60. Ibid, Dec. 2-3, 1971, and July 17, 1972.
61. EC, Oct. 5, 1971; NEWS, Jan. 1972.
62. WC, Status Report 2.
63. BT, Dec. 2, 1971.
64. Frick to author, Nov. 6, 1974, and statement attached.
65. AAC Statement for WC, March 10, 1972.
66. ACPRA working paper, March 20, 1972.
67. AAC statement, March 10, 1972.
68. WC, June 21, 1972.
69. Wells to BT, AAC, July 2, 1972.
70. Wells to Rhodes, July 2, 1972.
71. Statement to BT, ACPRA, July 17, 1972.
72. BT, July 17, 1972.
73. CUJ, Nov. 1971, pp.3,8-9.
74. Ibid, pp. 44-46.
75. Ibid, pp. 51,55-56.
76. NL, Dec. 1971.
77. NEWS, Feb. and June, 1972.
78. Frick address, ms. copy.
79. Frick to author, Nov. 14, 1974.
80. CUJ, Sept. 1971, pp. 7-9.
81. Ibid, March 1972, pp. 6-10.
82. Ibid, pp. 17-19.
83. NEWS, April 1972.
84. Brochure, 1972 National Honors Competition-National Communications Competition.
85. AR 1972, p. 6.
86. NEWS, Jan. 1972; BT, July 17, 1972.
87. Program, 1972 National Conference.
88. ACPRA Post-Conference Report, 1972.
89. Ibid.
90. Brochures, 1972 School for Administrators and Summer Academy; BT, July 17, 1972.
91. NEWS, June 1972.
92. BT, July 22, 1971; NEWS, Oct. 1972.
93. EC, March 1972.
94. AR 1972, p. 7.
95. EC, March 1972.
96. NEWS, Oct. 1972.
97. Frick address, ms. copy.
98. BT, Nov. 13, 1972, and Leslie statement attached.
99. BT, July 20, 1972.
100. Program to Increase Public Confidence in Higher Education, July 10, 1972.
101. AR 1972-73, p. 3.
102. BT, Feb. 26-27, 1973.
103. AR, 1972-73, p. 10.
104. Ibid, p. 2.
105. Ibid; NEWS, April 1973.
106. Committee on Professional Education Report, Feb. 27, 1973.
107. BT, Feb. 26-27, and July 10, 1973.

108. Communications Consultation Service Brochure; AR 1972-73, pp. 10-11.
109. CUJ, Sept. 1972, pp. 6-10.
110. Ibid, pp. 23-24.
111. Ibid, Nov. 1972, pp. 9-11.
112. Ibid, pp. 12-16.
113. Ibid, Jan. 1973, pp. 15-24.
114. Ibid, May 1973, pp. 19-29.
115. AR 1972-73, p. 10.
116. Conference brochures; EC, April 19, 1973; BT, July 9, 1973.
117. 1973 conference program, registration lists, conference report.
118. 1973 National Conference Report, p. 3.
119. Ibid, p. 5.
120. AR 1972-73, p. 3; EC, April 19, 1973; BT, July 10, 1973.
121. 1973 National Honors Competition—National Communications Competition.
122. *Renewal*, unpagenated AAC booklet.
123. Ibid.
124. JSC, April 18, 1973.
125. Joint Merger Committee, June 22, 1973.
126. JSC, July 12, 1973.
127. EC, Nov. 13, 1972.
128. Waldo memo, March 13, 1973; *Something New in ACPRA* (brochure).
129. AR 1972-73, pp. 7, 9.
130. Ibid, p. 1.
131. BT, July 9, 1973.
132. Report to Member Representatives on National Self-Study, undated.
133. JSC Status Report, Nov. 12, 1974.
134. Ibid; JSC, Sept. 26, 1974; BT, Dec. 5, 1973.
135. JSC, Oct. 3, 1973.
136. JSC Status Report, Nov. 12, 1973.
137. Myers to Gwaltney and Pride, Dec. 7, 1973.
138. JSC, March 2, 1974.
139. JSC Planning session, Dec. 27, 1973.
140. JSC, Jan. 19, 1974.
141. JSC, March 2-3, 1974, Appendix B.
142. Ibid, Action summary.
143. CUJ, March 1974, pp. 17-20.
144. AAC/ACPRA release, May 20, 1974.
145. JSC, May 7, 1974.
146. Ibid, Appendix D.
147. Ibid, Appendix E.
148. Ibid, Appendix F; *Interim*, Aug. 1974, p. 4.
149. OBd, May 29, 1974.
150. AAC/ACPRA release, May 20, 1974.
151. Main, Lafrentz and Co. to Leslie, May 23, 1974.
152. OBd, May 29, 1974, Appendix I.
153. Ibid, Appendices II and III.
154. *Interim*, Aug. 1974, pp. 19-20.
155. OBd, May 29, 1974.
156. *Interim*, Aug. 1974, p. 11.
157. OBd, May 29, 1974.
158. Crawford to members, June 25, 1974.
159. Conference Program and National Honors Book, 1974; MD, CASE, '75, II-III.
160. BT, Dec. 5, 1973.
161. *Ibid*; Conference program, 1974.
162. NEWS, April 1974.
163. Promotional brochures; BT, Aug. 8-9, 1974.
164. NEWS, Feb. 1974.
165. Hesse memos to members, Sept. 1973, March and April, 1974.
166. NEWS, Nov. 1974.
167. CUJ, Sept. 1973, p. 2.
168. Ibid, p. 3.
169. Ibid, pp. 10-11.
170. Ibid, Nov. 1973, pp. 23-25.
171. Ibid, May 1974, pp. 30-32.
172. BT, Aug. 8, 1974.
173. BT, Dec. 1973.
174. Ibid, April 4, 1974.
175. *Interim*, Sept. 1974, pp. 14-16, 21-23.
176. Crawford remarks, July 11, 1974.
177. Bennett to author, June 3, 1975.
178. Main, Lafrentz report, Aug. 31, 1974.
179. Crawford remarks, July 11, 1974.
180. NEWS, April 1974.
181. *Interim*, Sept. 1974, p. 3.
182. EC, Aug. 8, 1974.
183. *Interim*, Nov. 1974; Crawford memo, Sept. 30, 1974.
184. IRS to AAC/ACPRA, Sept. 23, 1974.
185. *Interim*, Nov. 1974, p. 3.
186. Brochure, district boundaries and purposes, undated; BT, Sept. 23, 1974.
187. *Interim*, Sept. 1974, p. 3; Nov. 1974, p. 4.
188. EC, Nov. 25-26, 1974.
189. *Interim*, Nov. 1974, p. 4; CASE program brochure, Dec. 1974; TECH, April 1975, p. 24.
190. TECH, June 1975, p. 22.
191. TECH, Oct. 1974, pp. 2-4.
192. Ibid, pp. 11-12, 28-30.
193. EC, Nov. 1973, pp. 25-26.
194. Name Committee Report, undated.
195. Computations from CASE Membership Directory, 1975.
196. *Interim*, Jan. 1975, p. 2.
197. MD 1975, pp. iii.
198. *We Will* brochure.

Index

AAC/ACPRA (*See Council for Advancement and Support of Education*)
Abilene Christian College, 331
Abram, Morris B., quoted 359-360
Abrams, Frank W., 200
Academic freedom, 150, 189, 190, 191, 195
Academy for Educational Development, 427
Adams, Arthur, 226, 243; quoted, 225
Adams, Bristow, his administration, 11-12; 100, 163; quoted, 9-10; death, 245
Adams, Joseph J., 391, 393, 401, 412, 420; quoted 399
Adult education, 118
Advancement, institutional, administration, of, 350, 394; budgets, 351; cost analysis, 373; definition of, 285; study of, 320
Advancement officer, responsibilities of, 285, 298, 366
Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education, 247, 260; quoted, 248-252
Advertising, 86, 304, 352; detrimental, 68, 80; in "educational supplements," 188; outdoor, 23
Advertising Council, 223, 232, 233, 244, 245
Aetna Life and Casualty Awards, 426
Agnew, Joyce, 391
Albert, Carl, 379
Alderson-Broaddus College, 123
Aldrich, Paul I., 12
Alexander, Russell, 68, 74, 75, 81, 82, 92
Alma College, 208, 333
Almond, James, 121, 175; quoted, 154
Alumni funds, 60, 118
Alumni programs, essentials for success, 249, 250; international, 428; objectives, 249
American Alumni Council, 42, 46, 136, 172, 178, 201, 229, 259, 342; *Alma Mater, 418; Commentary*, 418; cooperative efforts with ACPA and ACPRA, 54, 66, 77, 169, 198, 199, 203, 212, 230, 233, 238, 240, 243, 244, 248, 252, 253, 254, 255, 259, 260, 266, 291, 292, 299, 30[illegible], 324, 340, 342, 358; liaison with ACPRA, 178, 179, 255, 300-301, 307, 311, 309-315, 324, 326-327, 353, 377-378, 391-394; opinion surveys, 312-313; policy statements, 324-325, 421; self-studies, 410-411; "spirit of merger" statement, 411. (*See also Council for Advancement and Support of Education*)
American Association for Higher Education, 405
American Association of Agricultural College Editors, 7, 9, 11, 17, 42
American Association of College News Bureaus, 1-30, 268; constitution, 5, 20, 21, 25, 30, 36; conventions, 4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22-23, 24-25, 26, 28-29, 31-34; cooperative efforts, 30, 31; dues, 5, 20, 21, 30; finances, 6, 16, 20, 36; founders, 4; Future of the Association, Committee on, 15, 19, 20; membership, 4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, 26, 34, 35; name change, proposals and actions, 18, 21, 28, 29, 30; national office, suggestion for, 26; news clinics, 17, 19, 33; officers—1917-20, 4-5; 1920, 8; 1920-21, 10; 1921-22, 12; 1922-23, 13; 1923-24, 15; 1924-25, 16; 1925-26, 17; 1926-27, 20; 1927-28, 21; 1928-29, 25; 1929-30, 29; placement service, 12, 14, 26; publications—AACNB *News Letter*, 22, 25, 26, 30, 34; *Correspondence Clinic*, 20, 21, 22; *Occasional Bulletin*, 8, 11, 14, and *Occasional News Letter*, 13; purpose, 5, 15, 20, 21; research, 27, 31, 34; Research Committee, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23; resolutions, 25; rosters, 4, 6, 25; Standards of Practice, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 34; surveys, 6, 20, 21, 23
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 152, 159, 168, 198, 201, 209, 258
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, 208
American Association of Collegiate Registrars (and Admissions Officers), 9, 198, 209, 404
American Association of (Community and) Junior Colleges, 209, 229, 316, 352, 371, 382, 391, 404
American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 400
American (National) Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 61, 229, 258, 361, 390, 400
American Association of Teachers Colleges, 139
American Association of Teachers of Journalism, 3, 15
American Association of University Professors, 229, 243, 342, 406
American Association of University Women, 342, 427
American City Bureau-Beaver Associates, 334, 335
American College Publicity Association, 1, 2, 30-138; awards, 67, 74, 81, 91, 101-102, 111, 121, 137; Code of Ethics, 74, 92, 101; committees, special—on Action in Case of War, 87; on Cooperation With National Defense, 95; on Educational Service, 94; on Postwar Planning, 121, 125; on War Cooperation, 111, 121, and Plans and Policies, 125, 133, 136; constitution, 36-37, 40, 54, 62, 68, 91, 121, 136; consulting services, 88, 122, 133; conventions, 33-34, 36, 41, 42-43, 45-48, 49-52, 55-57, 61-63, 67-68, 71-75, 80-82, 87, 89-93, 100-103, 109-113, 121-122, 134-137; convention reports, 4, 48; cooperative efforts, 54, 66, 77, 111, 112, 114, 126, 133; district activities, 40, 46, 49, 66, 74, 102, 106, 126, 131; district organization, 36, 40-41, 43, 51, 54, 62; dues, 42, 43, 44, 54, 91, 106, 136; endowment fund, 122; exhibits, 38, 134; Executive Committee, 35, 40, 42, 44, 45, 54, 56, 58, 63, 68, 69, 75, 81, 83, 87,

88, 92, 125, 126; finances, 36, 43, 53, 62, 67, 68, 69, 81, 92, 102, 112, 113, 122, 137; gavel, story of, 113; grant received, 131; honorary members, 68, 74, 91, 100, 102, 103, 111, 121, 136; international scope, 61; membership—1929-30, 34; 1930-31, 35; 1931-32, 43;1932-1933, 43; 1933-34, 45; 1934-35, 50; 1935-36, 53; 1936-37, 61, 62; 1937-38, 64, 67; 1938-39, 74; 1939-40, 81; 1940-41, 88; 1941-42, 102; 1942-43, 106; 1943-44, 122; 1944-45, 126, and 1945-46, 137; name change proposals and actions, 47, 48-49, 125, 126, 136; national office, proposals for, 54, 68, 73, 112, 122, 136; objectives, 78 83; officers—1930-31, 35; 1931-33, 37, 42; 1933-34, 43; 1934-35, 47, 49, 50; 1935-36, 51-52; 1936-37, 56-57; 1937-38, 62; 1938-39, 68; 1939-40, 75; 1940-41, 81, 82; 1941-42, 92; 1942-43, 102; 1943-44, 112; 1944-1945, 122, and 1945-46, 131; picture, first of convention, 36; placement service, 41, 105; publications—advertising in, 53, 80; *College Publicity Digest*, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 78, 83, 84, 86, 89, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 105, 114; *Ink Slings*, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 53, 54, 58; *Publicity Digest* (convention reports), 105, 121; *Publicity Problems* (convention reports), 55, 81, and *Publicity Problems* (magazine), 105, 107, 109, 114, 115, 116, 117, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 131, 136, 138; purpose, 36, 54; research, 37-38, 50, 51, 59-60, 62, 66, 72-73, 87; resolutions, 38, 47, 56, 63, 68, 74, 101, 122, 137; Silver Anniversary, 80, 93, 99; slogan, 84; Standards of Practice, 41, 92; surveys, 34, 43, 45, 50, 54, 62, 64, 66, 97, 117-119, 129-130; women's activities, 62, 64, 80, 87

American College Public Relations Association, 136-417; Administrative Section, 244, 255, 258, 265, 274, 275, 309; advertising—classified, 281, 291, 301 and display, 147, 231, 281; American Alumni Council—cooperative efforts with, 169, 198, 199, 203, 212, 230, 233, 238, 240, 243, 244, 248, 252, 253, 254, 255, 259, 260, 266, 291, 292, 299, 300, 324, 340, 358, 421; liaison with, 178, 179, 255, 300-301, 307, 311, 309-315, 324, 326-327, 353, 377-378, 391-394, 410-412, and merger approval, 414; audio-visual cassettes, use of, 401; Articles of Organization, 263, 270, 327, 346, 402, 415; awards—155, 156, 172; Ashmore, 410, 426; Dinosaur, 343, 354; Distinguished Article, 343, 349, 362, 388, 400; Helms Foundation, 121, 137, 148; Pacemaker, 343; Presidential citations, 360, 375, 400; Publications Leadership; 353, 361, 375, 387, 400; Seasoned Sages, 376, 388, 400, and distinguished service and achievement, 76, 148, 155, 156, 172, 178, 193, 200, 201, 210, 216, 226, 236, 259, 268, 275, 288, 297, 306, 319, 331, 343, 353, 360, 375, 388, 410, 426; Board of Advisers, 274, 340; Board of Directors, 155, 158, 169, 172, 173, 177, 180, 188, 192, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 209, 212, 223, 236, 238, 245, 260, 263, 265; Board of Trustees, 262, 271, 272, 273, 280, 287, 289, 290, 291, 294, 300, 301, 302, 306, 307, 310, 320, 321, 323, 325, 327, 328, 331, 348, 357, 361, 372, 380, 382, 388, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 400, 403, 405, 412, 426; budgets, 166, 176, 192, 204, 232, 270, 280, 290, 292, 303, 332, 333, 341, 354, 355, 361, 388, 401; bylaws, 203-204, 211, 213, 231, 263, 274, 286, 291, 293, 302, 320, 340, 361, 391; Code of Ethics, 155; commissions, 280; committees, special—Governmental Affairs, 422; International Programs Study, 316; International Relations, 323, 339, 340, 348, 356, 370; Joint Study (with AAC), 411-412, 415; Liaison (with AAC), 300, 301, 307, 311, 309-315, Merger Study (with AAC), 412; on Interpretation of Academic Responsibility, 200; on Mutual Cooperation, 181-182; on Professional Advancement, 323, 339, 346, 404; on Publications, 256, 329; on Taxation and Philanthropy, 291, 303, 307, 317, 322, 323, 328, 329, 339, 348, 368, 404; Plans and Policies, 148, 151, 163, 172, 181, 184, 188, 192, 200, 252, 303, 307, 317, 322, 323, 328, 329, 339, 348, 368, 404; Professional Education, 404, 405, 421; Public Affairs, 390, 404, 421; Public Relations Planning, 209, and Research Advisory, 276; communications competitions, 400, 410; Communications Section, 233, 235, 244, 255, 256, 265, 274, 275; conferences—federal liaison, 368, 379-380, 422; national (with AAC), 260, 263, 347, 353, 358; for presidents, 264, and special, 370, 396, 409, 422; constitution, 136, 155, 172; consulting services, 159, 245, 255, 265, 276, 372, 391, 405, 422; convention policy, 180, 184, 192, 213, 344, 371; conventions, national, 145-148, 153-157, 161-164, 169, 171-174, 180-183, 190-193, 198-201, 208-210, 211, 216-218, 225-227, 234-236, 239-240, 243-245, 246-247, 254, 258-259, 263, 268-269, 275, 286, 288, 294-299, 305-306, 319-321, 329-332, 344-345, 353, 358, 359-362, 374-375, 387-389, 400-401, 409-410, 425-426; cooperative efforts, 132, 144, 152, 158, 159, 168, 198, 208-209, 211, 213, 214, 222, 230, 231, 235, 243, 244, 264, 266, 292, 300, 316, 323, 340, 382, 403, 404; councils, 274, 282, 290, 291, 301, 303; Development Section, 212, 220, 222, 225, 233, 244, 255, 256, 265, 275, 322; district activities, 152, 169, 181, 192, 200, 212, 223, 244, 253, 274, 283, 284, 291, 300, 301, 303, 326, 329, 371, 382, 391, 396; district officers' conferences, 283, 318; district organization, 155, 172, 200, 223, 236, 266, 300; dues, 136, 148, 151, 155, 166, 167, 172, 204, 236, 243, 245, 263, 271, 274, 294, 302, 320, 323, 341, 354, 373, 388, 413; Executive Committee, 137, 144, 151, 152, 160, 204, 212, 213, 215, 223, 225, 229, 230, 231, 235, 243, 244, 245, 253, 254, 255, 259, 260, 265, 267, 270-271, 272, 273, 274, 280, 287, 289, 290, 294, 303, 306, 307, 310, 316, 317, 321, 324, 331, 335, 340, 341, 343, 344, 346, 361; finances, 137, 147, 155, 169, 176, 192, 199, 204, 209, 216, 226, 232, 245, 258, 268, 270, 273, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287, 290, 297, 301, 302, 320, 331, 332, 333-334, 354, 355, 361, 376, 388, 401, 413, 426; foundation, 212, 223, 236, 244; FYI Folders, 264, 276; governmental relations, 372, 390; grants and gifts received, 131, 152, 158, 166, 175, 230, 237, 258, 271, 273, 279, 286, 292, 306, 334, 355, 361, 370, 375, 381, 396, 408, 410, 416; Greenbrier Conference, 203, 238-240, 247-253, 260; history, 178, 331, 344; honorary advisers, 245; honorary members, 163, 164, 172, 182, 201, 245, 268; honors competitions, 268, 275, 286, 291, 292, 306, 319, 331, 334, 335, 344, 353, 361, 375. 387-388, 400, 410, 421, 426; information kits, 380, 381, 398, 405, 422; institutes, 255, 264, 280, 303, 307, 316, 328, 335, 357, 409; international programs, 315, 316, 323, 348, 356, 370-371; internships, 276, 347, 356, 382; junior colleges, services for, 294, 316, 382, 391, 422; Lending Library, 286, 291, 292, 301, 306, 314, 315, 326, 340, 353; logo, 361; long-range planning, 307, 344, 347; management programs, 368, 396, 404-405, 408-409; management studies, 350-351, 357, 372, 381, 384, 394-395; market studies, 117, 416; Medical (and Public Health) Section, 171, 193, 198, 209, 211, 222, 233, 244, 255, 265, 274, 275; membership—1945-46, 137; 1946-47, 147; 1947-48, 155; 1948-49, 162; 1949-50, 173; 1950-51, 181; 1951-52, 191; 1952-53, 199; 1953-54, 204; 1954-55, 212; 1955-56, 222; 1956-57, 236; 1957-58, 243; 1958-59, 258; 1959-60, 268; 1960-61, 271; 1961-62, 286; 1962-63, 292; 1963-64, 299; 1964-65, 320; 1965-66, 329; 1966-67, 333; 1967-68, 355; 1968-69, 361; 1969-70, 376; 1970-71, 388; 1971-72, 401; 1972-73, 413, and 1973-74, 426; membership categories, 163, 203, 243, 361, 413; membership surveys, 315, 326, 358; microfiche, 348, 380, 405, 422; name change, discussions and actions, 261, 263, 272, 287, 289-290, 305, 328, 341-343, 388; national office—approved, 166; established, 167, 174-175; first year's accomplishments, 176; moved, 229; objectives, 402-403, and sought, 147, 148, 151, 158; newcomers, services for, 198, 204, 221, 235, 264, 276, 303, 316, 371, 374, 422; new look sessions, 319, 331, 353, 360, 375, 387; Nicholson report, 287, 291; objectives, 344, 346, 402; officers—1946-47, 137; 1947-48, 148; 1948-49, 156; 1949-50, 163; 1950-51, 173, 177; 1951-52, 182; 1952-53, 193, 197; 1953-54, 201; 1954-55, 210; 1955-56, 216; 1956-57, 226; 1957-58, 236; 1958-59, 246; 1959-60, 259; 1960-61, 268; 1961-62, 271; 1962-63, 287; 1963-64, 297; 1964-65, 307; 1965-66, 321; 1966-67, 333; 1967-68, 345; 1968-69, 354; 1969-70, 362; 1970-71, 376; 1971-72, 388; 1972-73, 401, and 1973-74, 413-414; open houses, 264; packet service, 198, 204, 235, 264; placement services, 144, 151, 204, 231, 244, 255, 265, 281, 291, 301, 314, 315, 327, 347; policy statements, 213, 325-326, 344; publications—*ACPRA News*, 398, 418, 422; ACPRA *News Letter (Newsletter)*, 167, 169, 172, 176, 177, 180, 186, 187, 188, 196, 197, 207, 211, 218, 226, 229, 231, 232, 243, 281, 283, 291, 292, 301, 317, 318, 327, 329, 358, 366, 398, 418, 422, 423, 426; *Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education*, 247, 248-252, 260; *Annual Reports*, 239; *Better Publications*, 292; *Big Gift, The*, 282; *Bibliography of Educational Public Relations*, 169, 176, 264; *Casebook of Institutional Advancement Programs*, 368; *Case Studies*, 328, 329, 335, 340, 356; *Casos y Experiences*, 356; *College and University Journal*, 281, 284, 292, 293, 303, 304, 317, 318, 328, 329, 330, 335, 348-349, 359, 362, 368, 372, 382, 384, 385, 390, 398, 405, 413, 418, 423; *College Publicity Manual*, 152, 161; *College Public Relations*, 140, 141, 143, 144, 148, 150, 151, 159, 160, 163; *College Public Relations Annual*, 137, 144, 155; *College Public Relations Quarterly*, 163, 167, 169, 172, 186, 190, 194, 195, 196, 197, 204, 215, 221, 224, 231, 264; *Communications Techniques*, 281, 282; *Convention Reports*, 235; *Dateline Washington*, 404, 418, 422; *Development Institute Papers*, 281, 282; *District Officers (Directors) Manual*, 284, 329; *Education Abstracts*, 169, 243, 265, 303, 317, 328, 329, 418, 422; *Education '64—University From Diversity*, 315; *Federal Affairs Handbook*, 404; *Federal Government Programs for Colleges and Universities*, 282; *Federal Government Programs Newsletter*, 281; *Focus on Understanding and Support of Higher Education*, 357, 372, 381; *Grapevine*, 281, 317, 328, 400; *Guideline to Gift Records*, 315; *Hard Times for Higher Education*, 381; *Higher Education and Tax Motivated Giving*, 335; *Long-Range Planning for Colleges and Universities*, 282; *Membership Directory and Annual Report(s)*, 190, 213, 235, 317, 329, 413; *Occasional Ficherman*, 398; *Placement Letter (Newsletter)*, 301, 303, 315, 317, 347; *Postwar Education in American Colleges and Universities*, 117-119; *Pride*, 232, 233, 237, 239, 240, 242, 256, 264, 268, 273, 276, 281; *Reference Manual*, 281, 282; *Securing Support for Higher Education*, 400, 405; *Selected Bibliography on College Public Relations and Development*, 282, 315; *Selected Case Studies*, 315; *Selected Papers*, 282; *Suggestions for District Activities*, 181; *Tax Climate for Philanthropy*, 358; *Techniques*, 328, 335, 352, 371, 375, 382, 390, 398, 413, 418, 422, and *Understanding Foundation Support*, 292; Publications (Advisory) Board, 144, 148, 155, 172, 182, 193, 201; Publications Critique Service, 255, 264, 291; publication services, 357, 381, 398, 422; purpose, 136, 327; reference library, 264; reorganization studies, 261-263; research, 214, 286, 304, 358; Research Coordinating Center, 256, 265; Research-Reference Center, 357, 362, 368, 380, 382, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402; reserve fund, 332, 333, 355, 412; resolutions, 137, 147, 193, 315, 321, 353; School for Administrators (Management; Public Relations, Alumni, and Development Officers), 318, 329, 334, 335, 353, 359, 374, 380, 401, 409, 422; seal, 214, 233; sectional organization, 204, 233; self-studies, 181, 412, 414-415; services, special, 263-265; Sports Section, 152, 181, 198, 209, 211, 233, 234, 244; Study Commission (1959-60), 254, 260, 261-262, 263, 270, 271; Study (Survey) Committee (1956-57),

229, 230, 237, 238-240, 248, 251; Summer Academy, 334, 346, 357, 374, 401, 409, 422; surveys, 171, 197, 202, 225, 338, 352, 358, 368, 380, 384; task forces, 274, 280, 354, 371, 411, 412; tax exemption, 231, 235, 244, 263; visiting practitioner program, 372; "Washington Assembly," 379-380; Wells Commission, 391-394, 411; workshops, 222, 233, 255, 264, 282, 290, 303, 316, 318, 323, 328, 335, 339, 346, 357, 382, 409. (*See also Council for Advancement and Support of Education*)
American Council on Education, 68, 87 122, 125, 126, 152, 159, 214, 222, 229, 281, 291, 292, 316, 374, 403, 406
American Council on Public Relations, 90, 137
American Education Week, 46, 49, 51, 53, 144, 158, 222, 235
American Football Statistics Bureau, 55
American International College, 387
American Legion, 49
American Management Association, 405
American Society of Newspaper Editors, 19, 24
Anderson, Donald K., 111, 112, 199; quoted, 94
Anderson, Reynold E., 376
Ansley, Bradford D., his administration, 218-227; 148, 156, 163, 173, 177, 179, 193, 210, 216, 235, 245; quoted, 197, 218, 219, 220, 223, 226-227
Antioch College, 67
Armsey, James W., 173, 183, 216, 222, 226, 231, 245; quoted, 179, 206-207, 237, 241-242
Armstrong, William, 358, 378
Army Specialized Training Program, 112
Arnold, Charles, 4
Arnold, Mrs. George A., quoted, 101
Ashby, Sir Eric, 335
Ashmore, Frank L., 259, 261, 265, 270, 271, 273, 274, 276, 282, 410, 426; quoted, 267
Asociacion de Universidades e Institutos de Estudios Superiores, 371
Associated Press, 44, 126, 129, 130, 164, 165, 358; quoted 39-40
Association of American Colleges, 30, 75, 122, 125, 126, 133, 137, 152, 158, 159, 166, 174, 175, 176, 193, 198, 200, 209, 214, 229, 291, 316, 390, 400
Association of American Medical Colleges, 171, 198, 209
Association of American Universities, 258, 390
Association of Collegiate Registrars, 198
Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 132, 167
Association of Private Colleges and Universities of Georgia, 354
Atherton, John W., 330
Athletics, 33, 37, 130, 193, 185
Auburn, Norman P., quoted 135-136
Auburn University, 316
Auger, D. G., 10
Ault, Quentin, 291; quoted, 149
Austin *American Statesman*, quoted, 124
Avirett, William G., 137, 148
Ayer, N. W. and Son, 117
Babbidge, Homer D., Jr., 256, 284
Bacon, Annette L., 357, 372, 384
Bailey, Allen M., 75, 81, 82
Bailey, John S., 305, 318
Bailey, Richard P., quoted, 387
Baker, Clarence M., 4
Baker, Hugh P., quoted, 85
Baker, James H., 376, 400
Baker, John G., quoted, 17
Baker, Thomas Stockham, 26
Ballyhoo, 85
Bancroft, Roger W., quoted, 215-216
Barnes, Nathaniel W., 3
Bartley, E. Ross, his administration, 164-174; 112, 122, 133, 137, 152, 156, 163, 193, 216, 288; quoted, 173-174, 180; death, 366
Barzun, Jacques, 293
Basham, R. Arthur, quoted, 10
Baumgartner, Stan, quoted, 123
Beal, Denton, quoted, 288
Beaman, D. Robert, quoted, 385
Beasley, Richard, 233
Beatty, W. Barton, Jr., 182
Beeman, Alice, 152, 173, 177, 182, 193, 201; quoted, 185, 427-428
Behrendt, David F., quoted, 304-305
Bell, Louis H., 160, 163, 167, 169, 173, 182, 191, 200, 210, 243
Bell, Ralph W., quoted, 7
Beloit College, 353, 375
Benner, Thomas E., quoted, 32-33
Bennett, John E., 301, 329, 371, 428
Benton, William B., 284
Berea College, 134
Berlo, David, 316
Bernard, Robert J., 284
Bernays, Edward L., 13, 50, 117, 235, 405; quoted, 25, 51, 55-56, 111, 406
Bevins, Wesley E., Jr., 412, 418, 419, 420, 428
Biles, Fay R., 420
Bing, Phil B., 4
Bintzer, H. Russell, his administration, 288-299; 268, 271, 272, 273, 287, 343; quoted, 289, 297-299, 374
Birge, E. A., 12
Bishop, Robert W., 182, 188; quoted, 64
Black, Marvin, 156, 177
Black, Ruby A., 12
Blackwell, R. E., 63; quoted, 66
Blakeslee, Howard W., 74, 137
Blazer, Paul, quoted, 135
Bleyer, Willard G., 4
Blumenfeld, Harold, 160
Boas, George, 335
Bogue, Jesse P., quoted, 161
Boling, Edward J., 344, 358, 362, 390
Boling, Landrum, quoted, 374
Boochever, Louis C., his administration, 39-43, 31, 35, 37; quoted, 39, 41, 42, 43, 86; death, 198
Bost, Tom, 163, 211
Boston *Transcript*, quoted, 57
Boston University, 51, 55, 76, 77, 81, 279

Botsford, Wilson P., 58
Bowen, Howard R., quoted, 400
Bowling Green State University, 316
Boyd, W. W., quoted, 2
Bradberry, George L., 420
Brademas, John, 346, 379
Brady, Joseph W., 401, 414, 418, 419, 420
Brandon, Arthur L., his administration, 123-138; 34, 71, 91, 92, 102, 106, 112, 117, 119, 121, 122, 148, 152, 155, 166, 169, 171, 175, 184, 188, 223, 228, 236, 263, 289; quoted, 72, 124-125, 132, 133, 134, 141-142, 145, 294-295
Brecht, Charles, 200
Breedin, Brent, 329, 335, 338, 349, 351, 368, 374, 382, 385, 386, 398, quoted, 383
Bressler, Raymond G., quoted, 65
Brigham Young University, 353
British Broadcasting Corporation, 188, 228
Brock, William E., quoted, 360
Brooke, Edward W., 330
Brooklyn College, 207
Brooklyn, Polytechnic Institute of, 410
Brossman, W. Robert, 187, 246, 258, 354, 356
Brower, Charles H., quoted, 205
Brown, John Anthony, quoted, 257
Brown, Maynard, his administration, 22-26; 20, 21, 29, 43; quoted, 23
Brown University, 304
Brumm, John R., 4
Bucknell University, 187
Budgets, institutional, 45, 117, 399; publicity, 34, 45
Burrelle's Press Clipping Bureau, 53
Burtner, John C., 40
Busick, John R., 156, 161, 167, 193
Business support, 385
Busse, Alvin C., 31, 40
Butler University, 96
Butterfield, W. H., 281
Byrne, Charles D., 40
Byrnes, James, 130

Cahalan, Don, quoted, 154
Cale, Edgar B., 318; quoted, 330
California Institute of the Arts, 316
California State Colleges, 387
California, University of, 268, 361, 410
Callahan, John, his administration, 414-426; 390, 401, 412, 413; quoted, 423
Campus problems, 358-359, 360, 362, 367
Canham, Erwin D., 91; quoted, 100
Capp, Al, 330
Carmichael, Raymond, 233, 259, 264, 268
Carnegie, Dale, 78
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 33, 37, 74, 304
Carnegie Institute of Technology, 26, 74
Carnegie Tech Tartan, 157
Carpenter, Edmund G., his administration, 30-35; 23, 24, 29, 43, 80, 102, 152, 184; quoted, 34, 49, 187
Carrick, George W., 390
Carroll College, 80
Carter, Nelson, quoted, 50
Carter, Richard F., 276
Case, Everett, quoted, 117
Case, Harold C., quoted, 279
Case Institute of Technology Associates, 386
Case, James H., Jr., quoted, 98
Case, Leo O., 388, 414
Casebook of Institutional Advancement Programs, 368
Casey, Ralph D., 4
Censorship, 97
Center for Educational Television, 207
Central YMCA College, 80
Centre College, 361
Centro de Ensenanza Technica y Superior of Mexicala, 340
Chambers, M. M., 281, 400
Chance, Elbert, 304; quoted, 305
Chase, Harry Woodburn, quoted, 109
Cheit, Earl, 379
Cheshire, Richard, 404
Chicago, University of, 3, 268,331
Christian Education Magazine, 123
Chronicle of Higher Education, 388, 419
Cincinnati, University of, 63, 64
City College of New York, 207
Clark, Ralph, his administration, 26-30; 16, 21, 22, 25, 47; quoted, 23, 27, 70
Clark University, 331
Claypool, E. M., quoted, 120
Code of Ethics, 74, 92, 155
Coker College, 426
Colgate University, 68, 83
College and University Personnel Association, 291
College Entrance Examination Board, 404
College Publicity Manual, 69, 133, 152, 161
College Sports Information Directors Association (CoSIDA), 19, 153, 234
Collier, Edward R., 112
Collier, Eleanor Mosely, 75, 76, 122, 166, 167, 175, 178, 181, 192, 200, 216; quoted, 77, 179. (*See also Eleanor R. Mosely*)
Colorado State University, 426
Color reproductions, 208
Colton, George H., 300
Columbia Broadcasting System, 214
Columbia University, 200, 210, 304
Columbus *Citizen*, 1
Columbus *Dispatch*, 1
Coman, Martha, 35
Commission on Financing Higher Education, 196, 198
Communications, importance of, 189, 191, 406-407, 423, 424-425
Community colleges (*See junior colleges*)
Compton, Wilson, 204
Conferences, how to attend, 317-318
Congress, relations with, 379, 380, 384, 390, 404
Connecticut College for Women, 67
Connelly, Herbert L., 28, 144
Coogan, James H., 167, 198, 201

Cook, Robert A., 148, 152
Cooke, George J., 312, 313, 314, 326, 360
Cookenboo, Leslie, Jr., 240
Cooney, John M., 4
Cooperative College Development Program, 391
Corn, Paul E., quoted, 338
Cornell University, 39, 361, 375, 387, 410
Corporate Alumnus Plan, 214
Corporate 1% Program, 385-386
Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), including references to AAC/ACPRA, the transitional organization, 331, 355, 377, 417-433; AAC merger vote, 417; ACPRA merger vote, 419; Articles of Incorporation, 419; assembly, national, 427, 431; Board of Trustees, 427, 428, 431; budget, 418, 431; charter application, 417; commissions, 417, 420, 431; committees—417, 420; Executive, 420, 427, 431; International Alumni, 428; Joint Study (AAC and ACPRA), 411-412, 414, 415, 416, 417, 419, 420, 432; Legal Affairs, 419; Name, 420, 431, 432, and Search, 418, 420, 427; conferences, 428; districts, 428; dues; 418; finances, 418; grants, 416; institutes, 429; legal problems, 415; market study, 416-417; merger expenses, 416; merger study, 411, 412, 414; membership, 431; membership eligibility, 419; name selection, 431-432; national staff, 432; Oakbrook Conference, 414-415; officers, 417-418, 428; organizing board, 417, 419; pledge to members, 432; policies on assemblies, 431; publications—*Dateline Washington*, 429; *Education Abstracts*, 418, 429; *Interim*, 418, 422, 429, 431, 432; *Membership Directory*, 431; *Techniques*, 418, 422, 429, and *WE WILL*, 432; purposes, 411, 419; "spirit of merger" statement, 411; task forces, 412; tax exemption, 428; women, role of, 421
Council for Financial Aid to Education, 209, 212, 216, 222, 223, 232, 233, 240, 243, 245, 255, 258, 264, 265, 266, 275, 277, 284, 316
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 371, 391
Cox, John T., 173
Cramer, Robert V., quoted, 336
Cravens, J. W., quoted, 9
Crawford, Edwin M., his administration, 426-433; 390, 401, 412, 414, 417, 419, 425; quoted, 420-421, 426, 427
Crawford, Nelson Antrim, his administration, 12-13; 4, 10; quoted, 13
Crawford, Ralph P., quoted, 24
Creighton University, 52
Cresswell, Don M., 29, 34, 35, 36
Cross, Travis, 388, 390
Cuff, John M 69, 75
Curtis, Howard S., his administration, 247-259; 151, 156, 159, 160, 214, 226, 230, 236, 246, 343; quoted, 259
Cutlip, Scott M., 388; quoted, 410

Daddario, Emilie Q., 370
Damon, E. Kent, quoted 385
Daniels, Whitman, 163, 169, 176
Danilov, Victor, 275
Dantzcher, Walter F., 109; quoted, 49
Darden, Colgate, 288
Dartmouth College, 96
Dartt, R. L., 177
Davis, Paul H., 284
Davidson, Carter, 119
Davidson, Robert C., quoted, 224-225
Davis, Arthur Vining, Foundation, 416
Davis, Jewell Ross, 64
Davis, Ovid R., 316
Davis, Watson, 102
Dawes, Charles G., 165
Dean, John O., 390
DeCamp, John P., his administration, 63-68; 21, 22, 25, 27, 29, 35, 36, 37, 41, 54, 62, 74, 101, 102, 121, 133, 137, 144, 152 155, 158, 159, 176; quoted, 67, 166, 174, 175
Deferred gifts officer, 381
Dellenback, John, 379
Denison, James H., his administration, 308-321; 178, 255, 258, 272, 274, 287, 291, 297, 300, 301, 307, 332, 343, 375; quoted, 309, 310, 311, 312, 321, 343
DePauw University, 3, 160
Des Moines *Register* and *Tribune*, 275
Desmond, Robert, 334, 335
Detmold, John, 376
DeToma, Andrew A., quoted, 365
Detroit *Free Press*, 308
Deutschmann, Paul, 276
Development officer, role of, 221, 277-279, 366, 387, 395, 398-399
Development programs, 192, 196, 206; definition of, 331; objectives, 207, 257; organization for, 366; public relations in, 233, 295
Dickore, Marie, 21, 22, 25, 26
Dietz, David, quoted, 46
Dittman, Duane, his administration, 377-389; 345, 354; quoted, 377, 378, 389
Dixon, Fred, 63
Dixon, Jeane, 58
Dodds, Harold W., 284
Dolibois, John E., 420
Doty, George, 240, 242, 256, 266, 276
Drake University, 81
Druck, Kalman B., quoted, 132-133
Drummond, Lorena, 137, 143, 148
Duke University, 387, 400
Dunham, Homer, 52, 55, 57, 62, 111, 130, 208
Durbin, William A., 137, 145, 148
Durham, W. Harry, 418
Dussault, Arthur L, 163, 193, 210, 212, 272, 275, 376

Early, Steve, 164, 165
Eddy, Edward D., Jr., 232
Educational Career Service, 347
Educational Directory, 36, 416, 419
Educational Facilities Laboratories, 358

Educational Index, 49

Educational Press Association of America, 232, 405, 423

Educational Resources Information Center, 358

Effective Leadership, Inc., 410, 412, 416

Ehling, William P., 276

Eisley, Trennie, 81, 111, 121, 122, 187

Elder, Owen C., Jr., quoted, 425

Electronic media, 408-410

Eliot, Charles W., 304

Elliott, Frank, his administration, 18-22; 16, 17, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 43, 46, 53, 63, 65; quoted, 18, 19, 22, 29, 37, 42, 65-66

Ellis, Harold, his administration, 104-113; 29, 35, 37, 75, 81, 89, 92, 102, 112, 137, 172; quoted, 104, 106, 113; death, 279

Enarson, Harold, quoted, 423

Engel, A. William, 376

Erickson, Lowell J., 391

Esso Foundation, 334, 350, 357, 381, 384, 394

Etherington, Edwin, 380

Eurich, Alvin C., quoted 369

Evans, Richard, 328

Evaluation, importance of, 257, 401

Ewing, Oscar R., 167

Fairbanks, Wilson, 102, 111

Fairchild, Raymond W., quoted 99

Fairman, Milton, 127; quoted, 128

Faris, Paul, 137, 152

Federal Communications Commission, 74, 109, 127, 197

Feltus, J. H. Randolph, 68

Ferrer, Terry, 268

Field, Beatrice M., 300, 310, 313, 315; quoted, 309, 312

Fields, John E., 192, 196, 201, 212, 216

Fine, Benjamin, 111, 137; quoted, 98-99, 109, 153, 365

Finehart, Raymond L., 313

Fink, Norman S., 420

First Accrediting Corporation of America, 294

Fisk University, 26, 74, 375

501 (C) (3) group, 339, 368

Fleming, David D., 376

Flood, Daniel J., 422

Fluckiger, W. Lynn, 329

Flynn, Charles, 211

Focus on Understanding and Support of Higher Education, 357, 372, 381

Fogarty, Hugh, 92, 102

Folger, John K., 276

Football Writers Association, 126, 209

Ford Foundation, 203, 207, 220, 226, 229, 230, 231, 237, 238, 240, 271, 356, 370, 386

Ford, Gerald R., 379

Fordham University, 410

Ford Motor Company Fund, 410

Forrest, Winston E., Jr., 417, 418

Forrestal, Dan J., 235

Fort Hays State College, 208

Fort Worth *Press*, 104

Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, 104

Foundation Library Center, 233

Fowler, Holly, 416, 420

Frankenberg, Caroline, 1

Frankenberg, T. T., his administration, 1—11; 15, 20, 21, 28, 64, 100, 122, 131, 148, 152, 155, 161, 173, 178, 295, 335, 343; quoted, 4, 6, 7-8, 10, 11, 12, 102, 108; death, 245

Frantzreb and Pray Associates, 343, 388, 400

French, Marion, 151, 166

Frick, James W., his administration, 389-402; 368, 376, 377, 378, 388; quoted, 392, 396-397, 402

Friley, Charles Edwin, quoted, 71, 85

Frostburg State College, 400

Fulbright, J. William, 210; quoted 349-350

Fund for Adult Education, 200

Fund raising, campus unrest and, 358-359; costs of, 351, 373; early history, 336; essentials for, 84, 186, 221-222, 250-251; ethics in, 348; institutes, 255; legislation affecting, 206; organization for, 251; presidents in, 351; publicity for, 28; public relations and, 143-144, 154, 196, 207, 232, 239, 295, 358; volunteers in, 256-257; workshops on, 222, 233

Furbay, John H., 235

Furlow, John, 361

Gaffner, Robert, 422

Gale, Robert L., 273, 274

Gardner, Mrs. Elliott, 102

Gardner, John W., 243, 256, 259, 335

Gardner, Lillian, 64; quoted, 97

Garland County Community College, 426

Garner, M. Virginia, 4, 10, 13

Garrett, Paul, 127; quoted, 128

Gavit, J. P., quoted, 3

Geier, Leo, 268, 274

Gemmell, Edgar M., quoted, 266-267

General Electric Educational and Charitable Fund, 214

Georgetown University, 426

Gibbs, Rafe, 376

Gibson, Harold E., 144

Gift records, 110, 162, 240

Gillespie, Maralyn O., 420

Given, Kingsley, 102, 105, 112, 117

Glass, Meta, 87

Glenny, Lyman A., 409; quoted, 410

Glogan, Arthur H., 304

Goldberg, Emmanuel, quoted, 77

Gonser, Thomas A., 121

Gough, Priscilla, 40, 43

Gould, Samuel B., 256, 335; quoted, 257, 336-338, 386

Government influence, 162, 349, 383, 384, 404

Governmental relations, 372, 378-380, 384, 390, 422

Graham, Herbert, 4

Graham, Robert X., his administration, 68-75; 34, 48, 49, 52, 53, 55, 56, 63, 64, 83, 152, 174; quoted, 58, 70, 72; death, 198

Grannis, Mrs. W. C., 34

Gray, Clifton D., quoted, 59
Green, Edith, 306, 379
Green, Elizabeth A., 160, 172
Greene, A. Crawford, quoted 199
Griffin, Elizabeth, 211
Grossman, Max R., quoted 76
Guest, J. Alfred, 263
Guilford College, 410
Gustavus Adolphus College, 331
Gwaltney, Corbin, quoted, 407-408

Hagerty, William W., 330
Hahn, Arvin, quoted, 429-430
Hall, Charles A., 376
Hall, George, 163
Hall, Gertrude M., 91, 112, 131, 144, 152, 172
Halvarson, Carl M., 365; quoted 366
Hanna, Susan, 229, 276
Hannah, John A., 309
Hannum, Max E., his administration, 157-164; 102, 112, 122, 137, 147, 148, 152, 156, 166, 175; quoted, 151, 164, 171-172
Hanson, Abel A., 334, 339, 353; quoted, 348
Hardie, James C., 385, 386
Harding, Warren G., 164-165
Harlow, Rex, quoted 90
Harral, Stewart, his administration, 174-183; 69, 71, 75, 81, 82, 90, 92, 102, 105, 123, 156, 163, 173, 188, 225, 233; quoted, 70, 95, 97, 107, 182-183
Harrington, Harry F., 2, 3
Harris, Rufus C., quoted, 71
Harris, Seymour E., 284
Hartley, Joseph H., 330
Harvard University, 224
Harvey, P. Caspar, 112, 122, 144, 208
Hatfield, Mark, 286
Hathaway, Henry C., 29
Haughton, James F., 151
Hayakawa, S. I., quoted, 116, 317-318, 363-364
Haynes, Rowland, quoted 79-80
Heald, Henry T., 119; quoted 100
Healy, Kathleen, 58
Heath, Harry, Jr., 170
Hechinger, Fred M., 193, 201; quoted, 205-206
Heffner, Ray, 335
Heise, Ardys, 409
Helms Athletic Foundation Award, 121, 137, 148
Hensel, Harry B., quoted, 385
Herbert, Henry L., 35, 40
Hess, Fred, 201, 204, 297, 307, 315, 318, 319, 326, 333, 343, 353
Hesse, Robert R., 386, 398, 405, 407, 408, 423; quoted, 403, 407
Heston, Herbert, 230
Hewlett, Horace W., his administration, 299-308; 197, 200, 201, 259, 268, 271, 287, 297, 312, 313, 314, 343; quoted, 299. 307-308
Heyns, Roger, 403
Hezzlewood, Kenneth O., 29, 35; quoted 38
Hickerson, Loren, 238, 310; quoted 364
Hickman, E. C., 4
Higher Education Directory, 271
Higher education, goals, 403, 407
Hines, Neal O., 259
Hobart College, 43
Hoffman, Philip G., 330
Hogan, Patrick W., 345, 354
Hollins College, 353, 375, 387
Holmes, George H., 160, 197, 376
Holsten, George H., Jr., quoted, 342
Homecoming tradition, 80
Hometown stories, 207-208
Hood College, 426
Hoover, Herbert, 165
Hopkins, Everett H., 222, 223, 228, 230, 237, 240, 245, 260, 271, 280, 372; quoted, 221, 239, 284-286
Hopkins, R. J., quoted, 157
Horn, Francis H., quoted, 194-196
Horton, Arthur J., 412
Hoskins, Robert Lee, 352
Hostetter, D. Ray, 329
Houston, University of, 322
Howard, R. B., quoted 24
How to Use Letters in College Public Relations, 281
Howe, Stewart S., 212, 222, 236
Hubbell, Richard, quoted, 144
Huitt, Ralph K., quoted, 379
Hunter, Alice M., 10, 13, 14, 15, 16; quoted, 11
Hunter College, 207
Hunter, T. Willard, 307, 323, 331, 339, 358
Hutchins, Robert Maynard, quoted, 114
Hyde, Grant M., 4, 17; quoted, 8
Hyde, Ronald G., 412, 418, 420

IBM Corporation, 375, 387, 400
Illinois State Program for Scholarships and Grants, 383
Illinois, University of, 42
Image, building, 249, 407; improving, 429
Independent College Funds of America, 316
Indianapolis *News*, quoted 165
Indiana University, 3
Industrial Editors Association, 198
Integrity, importance of, 267
Intern programs, 159
Internal Revenue Service, 212, 231, 235, 244, 245, 268, 301, 428
International News Service, 41
Iowa State University, 268, 375
Iowa, University of, 159, 353, 388

Jackson, David G., 352
Jackson, James W., Jr., 264, 273, 274, 284, 294
Jacobson, Harvey, 304
James, Willard, 54, 58
Jenny, Hans H., 379; quoted 380
Job descriptions, 338
Johns Hopkins Science Review, 178, 228
Johns Hopkins University, 178, 268
Johnson, Dixon, 210
Johnson, Edith C., 35, 37, 43
Johnson Foundation, 292
Johnson, Franklyn A., 330

Johnson, John G., 300, 314
Johnson, Lyndon B., 294, 295, 306; quoted, 296
Johnston, Thomas R., 17, 20, 75
Johnston, W. Henry, his administration, 184-194; 122, 126, 131, 137, 148, 155, 163, 173, 181, 182, 376; quoted, 127, 185, 193-194
Johnston, W. Noel, 226, 229, 235, 242, 256, 258, 259, 261, 271; quoted, 244, 398-399
Joint Committee (Council) on Educational Television, 177, 236
Jones, John Price, quoted 28
Jones, John Price, Company, 240
Jordan, H. W., 4
Jordan, James R., his administration, 237-247; 159, 193, 200, 203, 210, 216, 222, 226, 228, 230, 235, 236, 239, 256, 268, 274, 290, 343; quoted, 244, 246-247
Josephs, Devereaux C., 230, 245, 256
Joy, Al C., quoted, 90
Junior colleges, 161, 293, 371; needs, 352, services for, 294, 316, 382, 391, 422

Kaiser, Edgar F., quoted 385
Kansas State (Agricultural) College, 19, 197
Kansas, University of, 197
Kefauver, Estes, 161; quoted 162
Kellogg, William K., Foundation, 374, 410, 416
Kellogg, Wendell, 173, 199
Kelly, Dana, 100
Kelly, Harry F., 309
Kennedy, John F., 280, 306; quoted 308
Kent, R. A., 60
Kentucky, University of, 62, 109, 122, 134
Keppel, Francis, 294; quoted 296-297
Kerbaway, W. Nicholas, 156
Kerr, Clark, quoted, 383
Keyo, Howard, 188, 329
Keys, William E., 183, 197, 210, 226, 231, 376
Kidera, Robert, 358; quoted, 350, 359
Killian, James R., Jr., quoted, 205
King, James, 198
Kings College, 304
Kirkwood, Marie, quoted 27
Kirkwood, William Paul, his administraion, 14-18; 4; quoted, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18; death, 233
Knowles, Asa S., 317, 426
Knowlton, Don, quoted, 190-191
Knox College, 67
KOAC (radio), 109
Koll, Michael J., 418, 419, 420
Kone, Eugene, 376
Kresge, Sebastian, 283
KSD-TV, 146

Lafflin, Alan, 376
Landman, David, 423; quoted 424
Landon, Alf M., 165
Lane, Myles, quoted, 208
Lawrence University, 426
Lay, Clemewell, 81, 92, 105
Lee, Harold N., quoted, 186
Lee, James Melvin, 3
Lee, W. Storrs, quoted, 64-65, 67
Leffingwell, Roy, quoted, 339
Lehigh University, 375, 400
Lehmann, Timothy, quoted, 101
Leslie, John W., 294, 300, 301, 306, 312, 313, 329, 331, 333, 344, 345, 354, 355, 357, 371, 372, 380, 391, 401, 402, 403, 404, 413, 416, 417, 418, 423, 426, 427; quoted, 302, 303, 305, 310, 381, 394-395, 408-409
Leslie, Mrs. R. H., 64
Lichtenberg, Bernard, quoted 120
Life, 63, 75, 199
Linson, Robert E., 378, 391, 412, 420
Listening, the art of, 317-318
Litchfield, Edward H., 319
Little, J. Kenneth, quoted, 169-170
Lockwood, Mary Ann, 409
Long, Jesse R., 210, 376; quoted, 161
Lord, Clifford, 317
Loschen, Robert T., 382
Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge, 426
Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council, 156
Lowry, Howard F., quoted 330-331
Lundberg, Louis, quoted, 185-186
Lundy, George E., 2, 131; quoted 78, 110
Lynch, Robert R., 388, 401, 414
Lyons, Louis M., quoted 107-108
Lytton, E. C., 23, 52, 54, 75, 80, 81, 82, 88

MacMurray College, 67
Madden, Edward D., 207
Madry, Robert W., his administration, 43-48; 35, 36, 37, 112, 121, 184; quoted, 28, 44, 47; death, 214
Magnuson, Warren G., 422
Maienknecht, Gilbert O., 189, 190
Mail, third class, evaluated, 338
Main, Lafrentz and Company, 343
Malik, Charles A., 286; quoted 293
Malott, Deane W., 119; quoted, 79
Management studies, 350-351, 357, 381, 384-385, 394-395, 408-409
Mann, Eugene, 376
March of Time, 61
Marland, Sidney P., 379
Marquette University, 30, 80, 331, 361, 375
Marsh, C. S., quoted, 61-62
Marsh, Daniel L., 51, 75
Martin, Harry E., 4
Marting, A. L., 122
Marts, Arnaud C., quoted, 67, 79, 143-144, 162
Marts and Lundy, 2, 133, 152, 175
Marvin, Cloyd Heck, 161
Marvin, Dwight, quoted, 99
Maryland, University of, 401
Mason, Medora, 148
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 387
Massey, Dyar, his administration, 345-355, 236, 271, 287, 297, 300, 307, 321, 333, 356, 371; death, 354
Massey, Nancy, 346

Matthews, D. C., 4
Matthies, Roland C., 291, 303, 307, 317, 323, 331, 339, 348, 362, 368, 376, 404
Mattox, Joseph H., Jr., 193
McAfee, Mildred H., quoted, 85
McCarthy, Alan W., 313
McCarthy, Robert E., 390
McCartney, Robert J., 287
McClelland, Kellogg D., 4
McCurdy, Charles P., Jr., quoted, 178-179
McGill, William J., 374; quoted, 375
McGranahan, Robert, 226
McGrath, Earl J., 161
McKeown, Boyd H., 156, 201
McKinney, Robert, 163
McLuhan, Marshall, 335
McNamara, William A., 405, 423
McNeil, Robert H., 44, 45, 48
McNitt, H. A., 70
McPhee, Julian A., quoted, 189
Mead Paper Company, 286, 292
Methodist Board of Education, 123
Michigan State University, 178, 331, 333
Michigan, University of, 17, 177, 427
Miers, Earl Schenck, 109
Milbourn, Max, 148, 156
Miller, Clyde R., 35
Miller, Douglass W., 15, 16, 17, 20, 121, 126, 152, 190, 193; quoted, 123, 146
Miller, Helen Munns, 152
Mills College, 67
Milwaukee-Downer College, 80
Milwaukee *Journal*, 208
Mink, Oscar, 416
Minnesota College Fund Association, 186
Miss, Robert E., 339
Mitchell, James M., 235
Mondale, Walter F., 380
Morehouse, Daniel W., 81
Morelock, Thomas C., 168
Morgan, Joy Elmer, quoted, 31
Morgenthau, Henry, 130
Morrill, Edna Geissler, quoted, 406
Morris Brown College, 401
Morris, Maynard, 177
Morse, Wayne, 360
Mort, Howard W., 238, 239
Morton, Ben, 229, 231, 232, 235
Mosely, Eleanor, her administration, 75-82; 34, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 62, 63, 64, 68, 90, 101, 102, 174, 175, 253; quoted, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77-78, 82, 112. (*Also see Eleanor Mosely Collier*)
Moser, John A., 305, 319
Mossholder, Robert L., 144, 148
Mother's Day, 80
Mount Mary College, 80
Movies, 23, 25, 27
Moynihan, Daniel P., 383; quoted, 384
Muirhead, Peter P., 379
Muller, Leo C., 264, 283, 290, 294, 301
Muller, Steven, 388
Murphy, Greta, 316, 333, 345
Murphy, James, quoted, 389, 390
Murphy, Joseph M., quoted, 84
Mutual Broadcasting Company, 81
Myers, Alonzo F., 169; quoted, 170
Myers, Gail E., 291
Myers, John Holt, 375, 412, 415, 417

Nangle, Eleanor, 121
National Association of Accrediting, 266
National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 48, 102, 109
National Association of College and University Business Officers, 404
National Association of Public Relations Counsel, 134
National Association of Science Writers, 209
National (American) Association of State Universities (and Land-Grant Colleges), 61, 229, 258, 361, 390, 400
National Broadcasting Company, 81
National Catholic Education Association, 214, 229
National Center for Educational Statistics, 416
National Center for Higher Education, 357, 368, 371, 373, 431
National Citizens Committee for Educational Television, 207, 209, 216
National Collegiate Athletic Association, 126, 153, 185, 198, 209
National Collegiate Sports Service, 55
National Committee on Education and Defense, 87
National Committee on Education by Radio, 38
National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 158
National Council of Churches, 214, 234, 243, 258
National Education Association, 49, 51, 53, 122, 125, 126, 144, 152, 158, 159, 168, 198, 209, 266
National Foundation for Higher Education, 374
National Medical Education Week, 222
National Science Foundation, 370
National Technical School for the Deaf, 426
Nelson, Lyle M., his administration, 270-279; 19[illegible], 200, 207, 229, 246, 259, 261, 268, 297, 331, 390; quoted, 255, 256
Nelson, Robert E., 265, 271, 273, 287; quoted 256-257
Nelson, Wilbur, 151
New Look papers, 319
News bureaus, values of, 23, 24, 25; emphasis, 304
Newscast, first, 20
Newsweek, 304
News writers, shortcomings, 24, 95, 365
Newton, Charles, 320, 324, 334, 350-351
New York *Evening Post*, 3
New York *Gazette and Post Boy*, 304
New York *Herald Tribune*, 38, 207
New York *Times*, 91, 178; quoted, 31, 62, 119, 385
New York University, 124, 224
Nicholson, Patrick, his administration, 322-332; 272, 287, 291, 295, 305, 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 320, 333, 340, 343, 371; quoted, 327-328, 332

Nickell, Thomas P., 273; quoted, 293
Nixon, Richard M., 368, 374
Notre Dame, University of, 375, 401
Nunn, William D., 173, 192

Oates, James F., 353
Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, 391
Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges, 186-187
Ohio State Journal, 1, 2
Ohio State University, 177
Olpin, A. Ray, quoted, 199
Olson, Richard C., quoted, 384
Opinion sampling, 79, 154
Orr, Clifford, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 68, 70, 74, 81
Osborn, Marvin G., Jr., his administration, 259-269; 177, 182, 192, 193, 199, 201, 204, 210, 216, 229, 246, 254, 272; quoted, 259-260, 268-269
Osborn, Marvin G., Sr., 13, 15, 16, 247, 268
Osborne, Frederick S., 87, 121; quoted, 88, 95-96
Outdoor Advertising Association, 51, 53
Owens, Harvey J., 109
Oxnam, G. Bromley, quoted, 89

Pacific and Far West News Bureau Writers, 29
Pacific Lutheran University, 331
Parry, Thomas, quoted, 86
Pastorious, Tom, 193
Pate, Rudolph, 390
Patrick, Kenneth, 235; quoted, 191
Patterson, Frederick D., 400
Patterson, W. A., 7
Paulison, Walter, 68, 105
Pavlin, Andrew, 121
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, 283
Peavey, Marion, 352
Pekrul, Leota, 211
Pell, Claiborne, 404; quoted, 379
Pellegrin, Frank, his administration, 52-57; 34, 43, 45, 50, 58, 61, 252; quoted, 52, 57
Pennsylvania State University, 187, 400
Pennsylvania, University of, 331
People to People Program, 235
Perdue, James E., 423
Perkins, Carl, 379, 404
Persons, C. E., 281
Petritz, Joseph, 55, 57, 111
Pettit, George, 236; quoted, 105, 241
Philadelphia College of Arts, 426
Philanthropy, records of 60, 110, 162, 209, 214, 222, 240-241
Phillips, Donald E., 148
Piercy, J. W., 4
Pimlott, J. A. R., 148; quoted, 215
Pinkerton, William M., 306
Pinney, Richard D., 242
Pittsburgh *Press*, 157
Pittsburgh *Sun-Telegraph*, 157
Pittsburgh, University of, 69, 410
Planning, essentials in, 369, 395; importance of, 369; long-range, 396; public relations, 66, 79, 179, 339
Poole, Gray, 228
Poole, Lynn, his administration, 228-237; 163, 168, 177, 178, 182, 188, 197, 210, 211, 214, 216, 219, 222, 223, 226, 260; quoted, 160, 168, 228, 229, 237, 258, 260; death, 366
Porter, William E., 239, 247; quoted 248-251
Postal rates and regulations, 51, 55, 177
Postwar Education in American Colleges and Universities, 117-119
Poutas, Bernice, 427
Pray, Francis C., his administration, 210-218; 78, 102, 108, 109, 144, 148, 156, 168, 182, 187, 188, 193, 199, 201, 222, 223, 226, 228, 229, 310, 376; quoted, 76, 105, 150, 202-203, 211, 217-218, 258, 277-278, 369-370
Prescott, Ruth, 358, 414
President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 222, 230
Prerau, Sydney, 323
Presidents, aids for, 258, 370, 375; in fund raising, 351; needs of, 140, 248, 387; opinions of, 31, 32, 59, 117-119, 130, 170, 384; responsibilities, of, 140, 185, 189, 193, 369, 375; workshops for, 255, 265, 266, 404 (*See also Public Relations*)
Pride, Cletis, 362, 368, 380, 381, 384, 398, 399 400, 405, 412, 416, 418, 427
"Princeton Plan," 381
Princeton University, 206, 224, 304
Pryor, William C., quoted, 24
Public Affairs Council, 422
Publicity, "balanced diet," 71; budgets, 34, 45; coordination, need for, 66; criticisms of, 9, 424; definitions of, 49, 128; in fund raising, 28, 84; functions, 425; goals, 31; importance of, 4, 10, 11, 49, 101, 103, 425; scope of, 29; standards for, 62, 91; stunt, 27, 70, 72, 74, 80, 92; a two-way street, 32; word-of-mouth, 79
Publicity directors, challenges to, 72; duties, 17, 18, 58, 59, 90; qualities needed, 31, 32, 59, 65, 85; responsibilities of, 11, 28, 82; standards for, 68
Public relations, administration, 238, 239, 324; advances, 224; a public trust, 72, 134; a team job, 120, 132, 143, 170, 186, 215, 220, 241, 295, 330; a two-way street, 32, 86, 220; a way of life, 141, 143; bibliography, 53, 169, 176; commandments for, 429-430; coordinating officer for, 239, 248, 249, 350; courses in, 77, 134, 224, 225, 233, 339; decalogue of, 86; definitions of, 90, 117, 128, 129, 140, 143, 215, 267, 406, 425; elements of, 99, 132, 142, 225; essentials for, 249; evaluating, 241, 256; expectations from, 190; faculty and, 206, 242, 252, 365, 424, 425; functions of, 135, 170, 194, 293, 425; history of, 224; importance of, 32, 67, 99, 108, 128, 295, 425; in fund raising, 143-144, 154, 185, 186, 206, 232-233; in policy making, 173, 189, 215; internal, 128, 360, 376; need for, 429; objectives of, 120, 146, 207, 208, 209, 223, 225, 249; opportunities in, 160, 171-172, 174, 219, 225, 298, 425; organi-

zation for, 238, 239, 258, 285; philosophy of, 128, 285, 321; planning, 66, 79, 179, 339; policies, 170; preparations for, 159; presidents and, 108, 140, 160, 170, 180, 189, 206, 365, 425; program building, 129, 277-279; "professional soldier" theory, 251; publicity and, distinction between, 120; responsibilities, 199, 205, 297; semantics and, 116; seminars, 122-123, 126; shortcomings in, 218, 424-425; special events and, 132; specialist, 145; temptations in, 336-338; understanding of, 140; women in, 117, 161, 421

Public Relations: A Program for Colleges and Universities, 137, 152

Public Relations Directory and Yearbook, 131

Public Relations for Colleges and Universities, 281

Public Relations News, 151

Public relations officer, as counselor, 127, 128, 135, 141, 219, 319, 339; challenges for, 196, 240-241, 247, 269, 288, 295, 299, 332, 345, 367, 396-397, 429-430; his job, 32, 56, 79, 107, 146, 242, 252, 257, 276, 279, 330, 332, 337-338, 339, 399, 406; qualities needed, 108, 182, 219, 249, 252, 257, 392; responsibilities of, 78, 82, 128, 134, 135-136, 141, 142, 143, 145, 156, 170, 174, 180, 185, 186, 190, 194, 195, 199, 208, 252, 277, 280, 350, 367, 389, 399; rewards of, 402

Public Relations Society of America, 127, 132, 194, 198, 222, 266, 316, 354, 376, 391

Quattrochi, A. W., 190, 209

Quie, Albert, 379

Quillian, Hugh T., quoted, 123

Radio, 20, 38, 74, 97, 102, 109, 127, 160

Radock, Michael, his administration, 355-367; 168, 305, 319, 333, 345, 347, 353, 369, 375, 377, 390, 391, 393, 412, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 420, 426; quoted, 355, 356, 366-367, 427

Ramin, Richard M., 420

Randolph-Macon College, 426

Reader's Digest, 385

Reck, W. Emerson, his administration, 83-93; 57, 59, 62, 66, 68, 75, 81, 101, 116, 121, 123, 125, 126, 133, 144, 148, 152, 161, 175, 181, 213, 272, 331, 343, 344, 376; quoted, 84, 92-93, 128-129, 143, 163

Redlands, University of, 400

Reilly, Robert, 320, 321

Reinert, Paul C., 243; quoted, 251-252, 401

Renegar, Horace, his administration, 148-157; 63, 92, 112, 122, 130, 134, 137, 161, 175, 180, 183, 184, 210, 376; quoted, 149, 156-157, 162

Rennebohm, Robert B., 377, 391; quoted, 378

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 387

Resource development, 369-370

Reynolds, Conger, 4, 235

Rhodes, Robert, 378, 391, 393, 412, 416, 417, 418, 420, 426, 431

Riche, Frances, 271, 272

Ridings, J. Willard, his administration, 93-104; 75, 81, 88, 92, 164, 184; quoted, 70-71, 94-95, 103-104; death, 153

Ridings, Paul O., 105, 112, 117, 122

RKO-Pathe pictures, 148

Roberts, David L., 376

Roberts, Dwight V., 412, 420, 428

Rochester Institute of Technology, 426

Rohrbeck, Edwin H., 17

Roosevelt, Franklin D., 46, 49; quoted, 89

Ross, Thomas J., quoted, 146

Rossi, Charlotte, quoted 97

Rounds, William F., 152

Rowland, A. Westley, his administration, 333-345; 235, 264, 286, 297, 316, 321, 328, 355; quoted, 223, 345

Rowland, Howard R., 400

Russell, John Dale, 161

Rutgers University, 111, 304

Ruthven, Alexander G., quoted, 79

Ryan, Charles J., 192

Ryder, Melvin, 4

Sailstad, Robert J. 192, 335

St. Leo College, 361

St. Louis University, 146

St. Paul *Dispatch*, 208

St. Sure, William P., quoted 91

Salaries, 32, 34, 45, 50, 187, 198, 232, 351, 373, 399

Salt, Charles F., 4

Sanford, Royal K., quoted 218

Sanford, Terry, 284

Saturday Review, 319, 320

Scarritt College, 123, 126

Schaefer, Arthur J., his administration, 279-288; 246, 256, 259, 268, 274, 289, 303, 307, 343, 383; quoted, 276-277, 280, 288

Schellenger, Harold K., his administration, 139-148; 47, 49, 63, 92, 102, 122, 131, 133, 137, 151, 152, 164, 166, 171, 175, 186, 187, 199, 376; quoted, 99, 108, 132, 139, 140-141, 147, 148, 153-154, 159

Schleich, Mrs. Jesse, quoted 129

Schoenfeld, Clarence A., quoted, 206, 217

School and Society, 115, 121

Schrag, Peter, quoted, 349

Schramm, Wilbur, 159

Schreiber, Alexander, 88, 92, 97

Science news, 27, 46, 370

Sears, Roebuck Foundation, 235, 292, 306, 319, 331, 334, 335, 344, 348, 353, 356, 361, 368

Seaton, John Lawrence, quoted, 160

Secondary Schools, 294, 361

Seelig, John Earl, 344, 420

Self-evaluation and improvement, 257, 269, 362, 388

Sembower, John F., 92; quoted, 98

Serenius, C. A., 148

Seymour, Harold J., 356

Shackelford, Nancy, 301

Shea, James M., 321, 324, 334, 345, 400

Sherman, Joseph, 112, 137, 182

Sherman, Nathaniel, 35

Shideler, Fred, 376

Shiebler, George L., 37, 121
Shultz, James M., 416, 421
Silvers, Earl Reed, his administration, 35-38; 21, 29, 111, 137; quoted, 36; death, 153
Sister M. Thaddeus, 105, 112
Skeele, Franklin, 81, 88, 177
Skidmore College, 74
Sloan, Alfred P., Foundation, 343
Sloan, Eugene, 376
Smelser, Laurence B., 24, 25; quoted 26
Smith, A.P., Manufacturing Company, 206
Smith, Alvie L., 198, 264
Smith, Charles E., quoted, 429
Smith, Donald E., 238
Smith, E. W., 4, 5, 12
Smith, Henry Justin, quoted, 23
Smith, Herman B., 425
Smith, Jeannette M., 75
Smith, Norman C., 425
Smith, Richard, 281, 292, 303, 329; quoted, 362-363
Smith, Stewart, quoted, 191
Smith, Veta Lee, her administration, 201-210; 156, 163, 168, 173, 182, 193, 228; quoted, 202, 210
Snavely, Guy E., 75, 158, 174, 175, 176, 182; quoted, 162
Snyder, Adelaide, 426
Sobel, Bernard, 4, 5
Sorensen, Parry D., his administration, 367-376; 156, 160, 173, 199, 351, 354, 377; quoted, 376
Sorensen, Theodore, 364; quoted, 365
Southern Association of Collegiate Registrars and Business Officers, 209
Southern Regional Education Board, 266, 366
Sparks, Frank H., 275
Speare, E. Ray, quoted 76
Special events, 132
Spencer, M. L., 4
Spencer, William A., quoted, 124
Spiers, Al, quoted, 165
Sports publicity, 19, 32, 33, 37, 55, 126, 127, 153
Sproul, Robert G., quoted, 89-90, 105
Sputniks, 246
Stadtman, Verne A., 299, 300, 312, 313, 314; quoted, 312
Stahr, Elvis, 286
Stalnaker, John Marshall, 297
Starbuck, Kathryn, 64, 68
State Universities Association, 258
Steinberg, Charles S., quoted, 424-425
Stempel, John, 16, 17, 19, 21, 33
Stern, George G., 276
Stewart, Ernest T., 238
Strayer, Gordon, 362, 376
Stromberg, Edward H., 52, 56, 62, 67, 122, 152, 182
Stuart, Nancy, 416, 420
Student recruitment practices, 56, 200, 429
Student unrest, 224, 355, 358, 360, 362
Stunt publicity, 27, 70, 72, 74, 75, 80, 92
Style sheets, 25

Sulzer, Elmer G., 78, 81, 102, 105, 109, 121, 122, 137, 148, 152
Suppression of news, 23, 28, 41, 92, 304, 362, 407
Supreme Court of New Jersey, quoted, 206
Surveys, objectives and values of, 338
Swank, P. F., quoted, 46
Syracuse University, 123, 126, 194, 264

Tapping, T. Hawley, 178
Taxation and philanthropy, 60, 291, 303, 307, 331, 339
Tax legislation, 130, 323, 358, 368, 380, 404
Taylor, Bernard P., 187, 294; quoted, 232-233
Taylor, Robert, 318
Tead, Ordway, quoted, 127
Telephone, use of, 129
Television, 80, 110, 144, 146, 160, 177, 178, 197, 207, 352; as sorcerer, 363-364
Tennessee, University of, 353, 410
Tensions, solving, 364, 370
Tertell, Conrad, 375
Texas Christian University, 104
Texas State College for Women, 43
Texas, University of, 81
Thackrey, Russell J., 360
Thomas, John M., quoted, 32
Thompson, David S., 321, 333, 378, 388, 391, 412, 420
Thompson, Ronald B., 205
Tifft, Floyd, 82, 92, 113; quoted, 95, 107
Time, 304
Titles, 33, 189, 192, 197, 208, 239, 250, 272, 299, 326, 333, 385, 391
Todd, Edward H., 7
Tolley, William P., 284
Topping, Marvin, 167, 174, 176, 181, 200, 216, 222, 226, 229; quoted, 211, 213
Towson State College, 410
Treaster, W. Lowell, 151, 156, 188, 235
Triolo, James S., 297, 316, 321, 323, 339, 340, 348, 354
Trippet, Byron K., quoted, 385
Trotter, Virginia Y., 421
Trustees, responsibilities of, 190, 265, 278
Tulane University, 63, 68
Turner, W. Homer, 259; quoted, 225
TV Forecast, 178
TV Guide, 178

UNESCO, 152, 159
U.S. Commission on Education, 36
U.S. Employment Service, 347
U.S. Information Agency, 258, 356
U.S. Military Academy, 102, 106
U.S. Office of Education, 49, 53, 95, 96, 125, 158, 159, 162, 196, 209, 266, 267, 338, 358
U.S. Steel Foundation, 258, 271, 286, 334, 361, 380, 396, 408, 416
U.S. Supreme Court, 206
Universidad Autonoms de Guadalajara, 348

Universidades e Institutos de Estudios Superiores, 371
Upton, Miller, 335

Valien, Preston, 379
Van Arsdale, T. W., 246, 260, 275
Vanderbilt University, 169
Van Doren, Mark, 317
Van Dusen, A. C., 220, 226, 236
Variety, 177
Vinson, Curtis, 35, 37, 40, 43
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 426
Von Brieson, Martha, 376
VonderHaar, Edward P., his administration, 194-201; 148, 156, 160, 163, 166, 173, 181, 182, 183, 184, 188, 192, 193, 202, 204, 209, 223, 229, 323, 339, 343, 375; quoted, 48-49, 201; death, 423
Vosburgh, Alice B., 122, 151

WABD-TV, 207
Washington *Post*, 208
Waggener, Marc G., 171, 193, 197, 201
Waldo, Robert G., his administration, 402-414; 376, 378, 388, 401, 420, 421
Walker, Grace, 25, 43
Walker, Paul A., quoted, 127
Walters, Raymond, quoted, 133
Walters, Roy N., 92
War Department, 111, 121
Warren, Fuller, 58
Washington University, 331, 353
Waters, Norman D., 110
Webb, Claude J., 376
Weller, Hayden, 144
Wellesley College, 67
Wells, Herman, 331, 378, 391, 417; quoted, 135, 319, 392, 393
Wells, Jackson, 163
Welsh, Matthew E., 165
Western College for Women, 2
Western Reserve University, 45
Westminster (Mo.) College, 331
Westminster (Pa.) College, 69
Wetzel, Nelson B., 55
Weyerhaeuser grants, 410, 426
WFIL-TV, 177
WHAS (radio), 62
Whetten, Lester B., 307
White, David Manning, 276
White House Conferences on Education, 167, 211, 222
White, J. Herbert, 420
Whitefield, Clarence, 347, 356, 362
Whitman College, 105
Whittington, Florence, 229
Whittlesey, Edward D., his administration, 113-123; 81, 92, 102, 105, 112, 148, 152, 156, 180, 183, 198, 376; quoted, 87, 115-116, 117, 119
Widmayer, Charles E., 88, 112, 144, 152; quoted, 96
Wiegman, Fred C., 119
Wilcox, William G., 178, 201, 204, 208, 236, 245
Wild, Arthur, 91
Wilder, Anne, 86, 106
Wildrick, Meade, 102
Wilkins, Roy, 319
Wilkinson, A. A., 68; quoted, 74
Williams, J. D., quoted, 168
Williams, john F., 40
Wilson, Eric, 43
Wilson, J. Watson, 73
Wilson, Roy K., 97, 102, 105, 137, 148, 156, 163, 168, 173, 177, 188
Wilson, Woodrow, 5
Wimpress, G. Duncan, 211, 214, 216, 224, 226, 236; quoted, 179-190
Wisconsin-Green Bay, University of, 426
Wittenberg College, 81, 83
Women, role of, 10, 117, 406, 421
Wood, Curtis, A., 376
Woods, W. W., 7
World Almanac, 88
Wranek, William, Jr., 126, 137, 153
Wright, Frank S., his administration, 58-63; 34, 35, 40, 45, 47, 51, 52, 56, 111; quoted, 61
Wright, Josef F., his administration, 48-52; 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 35, 40, 42, 47, 61, 91, 121, 126, 157, 165, 178, 226, 253; quoted, 12, 48, 49; death, 423
WWJ-TV, 20, 177
Wyllie, Cleland, 376; quoted, 124

Xavier University, 160

Young, Gerald W., 97

Zook, George F., 164
Zwingle, J. L., quoted, 221